

MEMO

TO: Stuart
FROM: Tim
RE: RS on WLKK Radio, Erie
3-28-94

Comments: A local radio news broadcast briefly mentioned RS's appearance in Erie where discussed welfare reform. RS said,

"What we have is moms raising children in single parent households simply breeding more criminals."

appearance in Erie where discussed welfare reform. RS said,

"What we have is moms raising children in single parent households simply breeding more criminals."

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Location: Carlisle
Mazland Industries
Date: 04/01/94, 11:30AM
Attendance: 35 people -- 25 employees and 10 supporters
(business people, politicians, and senior citizens)
Media: Carlisle Sentinel

Comments:

The meeting took place in the cafeteria of Mazland Carpets. RS was 1/2 hour late. In talking to some of the employees outside and at the event, I learned that very few knew or cared that RS was coming to the plant. The only way they found out was by reading the paper. Those who attended were hand-picked by company officials. One man wanted to attend and he was allowed, but the others were chosen.

The supporters that were there consisted of the plant owner or manager, Jeff Benjamin, the local Republican State Representative Al Mazland, and a Republican county committee member who introduced himself to me as the head of the local RS steering committee. Also in attendance were a number of older Republicans, probably donors. State Rep. Mazland introduced RS as a Congressional reformer, a dynamic campaigner, and a man capable of attracting Democratic as well as Republican support.

RS quickly launched into his presentation, not going into much detail apparently in order to make up time. The following are interesting quotes:

On why SSI benefits for drug addicts and alcoholics have increased so rapidly: "The program as you can see since 1991 to 1993 has doubled (unintell.) to 80,000 in just two years. Why? Because they started a program a couple of years ago called an outreach program in, in California, Illinois, and Michigan. This is a program where they were gonna go out and find these people and help them. Help them, how do you help them? You sign 'em up for the program. So they went out and actually recruited people to get into this program. And now, Michigan. This is a program where they were gonna go out and find these people and help them. Help them, how do you help them? You sign 'em up for the program. So they went out and actually recruited people to get into this program. And now, Michigan. This is a program where they were gonna go out and find these people and help them. Help them, how do you help them? You sign 'em up for the program. So they went out and actually recruited people to get into this program. And now, almost, well, roughly 60% of the people on this program are from those three states. Because they've been successful in going and getting people on the rolls. That's why it doubled over the last few years. So the Clintons thought this was a great idea. So they're now putting these offices in every state. And now we're gonna go out in every state and recruit people to put these, to put people on this program. This program's probably gonna double or triple. You say this is a waste of money. Why are we doing this? Well, let's put on our bleeding-heart liberal caps here for a moment, and say 'Well,

these people are sick and we need to help them'. OK let's say they're sick and we need to help them. Are we helping them? See that's the second question liberals don't ask. They, they say 'Well, we're gonna help them', but we don't ever evaluate the program to see if it actually works. Well, someone bothered to evaluate this program, and y'know what they found? That in the history of this program, in the history of this program, not one person has ever left this program through rehabilitation. Not one. Not one person has left this program and been quote cured, healthy. What we do is we pay people to stay on the program." Did the Social Security Administrator really testify that not one person had successfully completed treatment and left this program? He loves citing that. He also claims that the Administrator estimated that only 3% of drug and alcohol abusers receiving SSI are in treatment, although it's a requirement of the program -- might be worth checking this testimony to verify his statistics.

On work requirement and job search services: "Here's what we do: we do what President Clinton said he wanted to do -- 2 year limitation on welfare. You can be on welfare for up to two years, in your lifetime. Lifetime limit -- 2 years. After that 2 year period of time, in which during time, during that time, we'll provide education, provide some training, and job search, we'll do some counseling, job counseling, fill out resumes, interview for jobs, we'll help you get some work. After that 2 year period of time, if you haven't found any

work, you must work just to c-, just to continue to receive your welfare benefits. Not gonna get anymore money, just your welfare benefits, but now you gotta work 35 hours a week. 35 hours a week, in most cases, it'll be y'know, public sector, sort of like the, you remember the, I don't see anybody here old enough to remember this, but they had the WPA programs, the y'know, the, during the, during the Depression. They'd have people who couldn't work, ah couldn't find jobs, and they'd and they'd, they'd, they create a -- swept parks, and they built things, and th-, and they cleaned the streets, whatever it was. But you're gonna have people working and learning the value and ethic of work..." Does his program provide for more job training and education as he implies? He sounds a little out of touch here with his comment about helping people with their resumes. Also, he draws an interesting comparison between his

program and FDR's WPA - very unlike RS to invoke the memory of a Democrat.

On unwed mothers and welfare: "So what we've, what we say is that in order for Mom to be able to go on welfare if she has a child out of wedlock, you have to tell us who the father is. If you don't tell us who the father is, you're not eligible for any welfare benefits, none, not even medical care. You tell us who the father is or you don't receive benefits."

Question -- what if mothers really don't know who the fathers are? "The fact of the matter is Mom knows who Dad is, in all, in 99 point something percent of the cases, Mom knows

who Dad is. And that's not me talking, that's a Social Service Agencies who testified before our committee, who tell us that, who tell us that mothers know who the father is, it's just they have no incentive to tell us who the father is. So there are cases, yes, where Mom may not know, and in those cases, then, y'know then it's really up on a case-by-case basis for the state to, to, ah to determine whether, whether this person is ah in that situation. But it's another thing, if Mom knows that she isn't gonna receive welfare if she doesn't tell us who Dad is, y'know maybe she'll be a little more careful, maybe. Or maybe she gives us a list, say 'Well, it could be one of five'. Ah, I mean, y'know, I don't know what she's gonna do, but at some point we're gonna see her cooperate." Two major points here: first, the idea that this will discourage women from having children ties into his idea that illegitimate births cause and are caused by welfare programs. Perhaps we could highlight his probably poor voting record on sexual education to portray his plan as punishing unwed mothers without educating them. Second, his system of finding out who the father is has a potential to turn into a large bureaucracy as well as perhaps an invasion of privacy. He talks of providing lists, doing blood tests, bringing in the IRS -- it smacks of the big, intrusive government which he rails against.

On the overlap between health care and welfare reform:

"... a lot of the people, I hear from a lot of the folks I talk to, they're, y'know stay on welfare, particularly if they have a lot of kids, stay on welfare because the, because when they get a job on the, particularly a starting job, in many cases doesn't have health care, and then and they si-, somewhat feel trapped on welfare just to keep their health care benefits. So we have to do something about reforming health care. And if you look at this program, I mean it's a 2-year work re-, a 2 year period of time on, on, on benefits before you require work, well course the soonest this bill could be passed and it oughta be January of '95, and then 2 years later will be the first person would have to actually be required to work. So we have until really January of '97 to do something about health reform. And I think anyone will tell you that while you may or way...not...pass...something, this...year, we'll...certainly...pass first person would have to actually be required to work. So we have until really January of '97 to do something about health reform. And I think anyone will tell you that while you may or way...not...pass...something, this...year, we'll...certainly...pass first person would have to actually be required to work. So we have until really January of '97 to do something about health reform. And I think anyone will tell you that while you may or may not pass something this year, we'll certainly pass something over the next couple of years to do something about health insurance and providing it for low income people. So I, that's not as serious a problem as some would make it out."

On jobs available in today's economy: "Y'know, in a lot of cases, I mean there are jobs available. I mean they may be low-income jobs but I mean y'know, I started, I mean the first job I had was ah setting up conference tables, at a, at a, at a place, and then the second job I had was shining shoes and cleaning toilets. I mean, you start out at the bottom and you work your way up. That's wh-, that's what every-, that's what all of us do. I mean that's wha-, that's sort of America. And to say that, somehow or another, that shining hamburgers is

should, you should be proud of it. You may have to work more than one job. But you, you, you build up that kind of experience and it gives you an opportunity to get a better job." Might be worth checking whether he really did have the work experiences he claims.

On his own interest in health care reform: "We're gonna have to do something about health care reform. The question is, and I think everybody agrees that, that, that has, has to occur. And, y'know, I've, I've been actually pushing for health care reform, I always like to say since there's someone here from Senator Wofford's office who tapes all my meetings, and ah and I always like to say that I, I in fact had a welfare reform proposal, excuse me a health care reform proposal, ah y'know introduced and ah on the table before Harris Wofford ran his first ad, because we'd done a lot of town meetings and I heard a lot of questions just like this, and we went out and tried to find something to, to put together to solve the problem. Um, the question is how you do it. And, and there are y'know as vast differences from y'know, from here to here as to how you do it. Ah, what I believe is that you don't need the federal government taking over the health care system." Implies more expertise than HW in the field of health care.

On health care problems and solutions: "If, y'know if- , the funny thing is that we're gonna force you, and I would care, health care coverages here. Yea? Generally? By and large? Well, y'know federal employees are too. Federal employees like their health care coverage. Now, George Mitchell, the minor-, Majority Leader of the Senate introduced a bill to exempt federal employees from the Clinton health care bill. Why? Well, because people like their coverage, he says, and we shouldn't make them change. As if none of you do. As if nobody in the private sector likes their health care, that, that you guys, that everybody in the private sector does it wrong and the federal government does it right, so we should be able to do what we want. That's the mentality: that, that everything outside of Washington is bad, and everything inside of Washington is good. What we should do is we should build on what's good about the system, and change what's bad about the system. What's bad about the system and what's getting the, everything outside of Washington is bad, and everything inside of Washington is good. What we should do is we should build on what's good about the system, and change what's bad about the system. What's bad about the system and what's getting the, certainly the most publicity is the fact that there are people who aren't insured. Well let's go about insuring those people, gonna have to do something about health care reform. The question is, and I think everybody agrees that, that, that has, has to occur. And, y'know, I've, I've been actually pushing for health care reform, I always like to say since there's someone here from Senator Wofford's office who tapes all my meetings, and ah and I always like to say that I, I in fact had a welfare reform proposal, excuse me a health care reform proposal, ah y'know introduced and ah on the table before Harris Wofford ran his first ad, because we'd done a lot of town meetings and I heard a lot of questions just like this, and we went out and tried to find something to, to put together to solve the problem. Um, the question is how you do it. And, and there are y'know as vast differences from y'know, from here to here as to how you do it. Ah, what I believe is that you

a, in a minimum wage job get the same plan as you do? My feeling is y'know they should work. And they should get y'know should start out with a basic good-level coverage, and as you increase and you work harder and you make more money and you, and you, and you do better, you should probably be able, you should be able to get better coverage. It's the same thing as, y'know; does everybody go out when they come out of s-, when they come out of high school or college and, and buy a Cadillac? No. You gotta work. You gotta, you gotta be able to s-, y'know it's the ladder of success. And it's the same thing with health care. As long as we're providing people with good basic medical care, and, and making sure that noone is gonna go poor in this country, and noone doesn't have access to good primary care in this country, ah then, then that's what we should provide as a minimum level, and then it should be like everything else. The harder you work, the better you succeed, the better y'know, the be-, the more you get covered. Maybe you want y'know cosmetic surgery covered or eyeglass covered, or things like that. Those are the things that ah, that, that we believe is how the system works best. Because you create incentives for people to do what you want 'em to do. What? Work and succeed. What the Clinton plan does is whether you sit on your tail or work your tail off, you get the same, you get the same, you're treated the same. Everybody gets the same whether you're working hard or not working. Now, where's ah, where's the incentive to work? Where's the incentive for us to be productive Americans? I mean, y'know, you've heard a lot of people call it socialism. Well, it's pretty darn close. Because there really is no incentive for you to go out and work, if you're going to be treated like everybody else. Why? And that's why we have welfare. That's why people stay on welfare forever. Why work? You're provided for. I mean that's what, that's what's really insidiously destroying the fabric of our country, and the health care debate is as important on that issue ah, ah as to who we will be as a country as anything else. Guys like Harris Wofford and I know he's listening, guys like Harris Wofford believe that government should make everybody equal. I don't. The government should be in a position to give everyone an equal opportunity, that everyone has a level playing field from which to succeed, and if you work harder and you do better, you do better. That's how it works. That's how it works best in government should be in a position to give everyone an equal opportunity, that everyone has a level playing field from which to succeed, and if you work harder and you do better, you do better. That's how it works. That's how it works best in government should be in a position to give everyone an equal opportunity, that everyone has a level playing field from which to succeed, and if you work harder and you do better, you do better. That's how it works. That's how it works best in America."

On HW, welfare reform, and his rapport with Pennsylvanians: "And I give him (Sen. Moynihan) a lot of credit for moving this issue forward. If it wasn't for Moynihan, I mean this issue would be nowhere. Ah I mean, he is one of the few Democrats over there who, who really is, who really is ah is taking this issue on aggressively and, and trying to do something to make welfare reform happen this year, ah unlike our, our Senator from Pennsylvania who is ah nowhere to be found on this issue. The only thing, only place he's to found

is having people follow me around. I mean I've done, y'know he's ah, his people have attended more town meetings for me than, than he's held on his own since the time he's been in office."

Overview: An interesting meeting. I think it speaks volumes about his 'grassroots' tour of the state that he attends businesses where they choose the employees who can listen to him and don't inform the rest. Id love to get that out to the press somehow, but I don't have any evidence -- just the word of a worker.

Among the employees who did attend the meeting, I saw a lot of nodding heads during RS's welfare speech. Still, among these employees as in almost every meeting, the prime issue remains jobs and the economy. Every meeting, someone asks RS how he's going to create decent-paying, entry-level jobs with benefits. His answer -- decrease taxes and government regulation -- is, I think, a bit hollow and academic for these people. If HW can voice a better argument for creating jobs, I think he can neutralize any edge won by RS with tough welfare reform talk.

memo

TO: STU\MAX
 FROM: TIM
 DATE: 26 Sept 1994
 RE: Radio talk show with RS on WHJB 620 AM (Greensburg) at 12:30 to 1pm

A question was asked about PAC money. RS responded by denouncing the process by which PAC's allocate money.

"The thing that disturbs more than anything else about political action committees, is they tend to give to incumbents more than they do to challengers. They not to give to people who support their positions; they end giving because they think the person is going to win. They give them the money which insures them that they are going to win. I don't think you have that proper balance which you would with an individual who is more likely to support someone because they are philosophically in line with the direction of the country that that person would like the country to go."

In response to Ironman Jim's question on the Crime Bill, and how RS voted, he responded,

"Let me give you two things first of all, the overall amount of money in the first bill was substantially more, was about 15% more, that's number one. Number two, the bill that came out of the Congress- I voted against, I mean I voted for many amendments to try to change the bill. We were not successful. The bill- The bill that was coming out- What I was supporting was a crime bill, and I looked, and prior to passage of the House bill, the Senate had already enacted a bill that was substantially less money; it was around \$22 million, as opposed to the 26 that we passed, or the 33 that came back from conference in amount of money, but the Senate bill was a much better bill. It had a lot of tough anti-crime provisions. It didn't have all this baloney for prevention programs. It was very good bill and I thought it was important to get a bill from the House to the conference committee. And hopefully the conference committee would have adapted the Senate provisions which I could have been supportive of, unfortunately, instead of going to the didn't have all this baloney for prevention programs. It was very good bill and I thought it was important to get a bill from the House to the conference committee. And hopefully the conference committee would have adapted the Senate provisions which I could have been supportive of, unfortunately, instead of going to the House, they looked at the House, they looked at the Senate bill, not only did they slant toward the House bill, they went way beyond it and spent a lot more money

A question was asked about PAC money. RS responded by denouncing the process by which PAC's allocate money.

"The thing that disturbs more than anything else about political action committees, is they tend to give to incumbents more than they do to challengers. They not to give to people who support their positions; they end giving because they think the person is going to win. They give them the money which insures them that they are going to win. I don't think you have that proper balance which you would with an individual who is more likely to support someone because they are philosophically in line with the direction of the country that that person would like the country to go."

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Standard Welfare Reform Meeting
Date: 03/31/94

Comments:

The following is an extended synopsis of the generic form and argument of RS's welfare reform meetings. Attached to this memo are renditions of the 6 charts he uses in his discussions.

RS introduces himself to the crowd as a Congressman and a member of the Ways and Means Committee. As the Ranking Member on the Human Resources Subcommittee, he continues, the Republican leadership asked him to draft the party's welfare reform proposal. He then outlines the intentions of his bill - ~~to~~ provide a hand-up rather than a hand-out" or as he alternatively puts it a "safety net rather than a fishing net" which sucks you in and drowns you.

Launching into the body of his speech, RS uses 6 charts, composing his lecture around these visual aids. The presentation consists of three basic parts: 1) using the first chart to demonstrate the failure of the current welfare system; 2) outlining some major causes of the system's disintegration, using the next 4 charts; 3) closing with a synopsis of his welfare reform proposal, expressed in writing on his final chart.

During the first section of his speech, RS exhibits a pie chart which depicts the number of years spent on welfare by recipients. The numbers break down as follows: 65% of welfare recipients remain on the system for 8+ years; 17% for 5-7 years; 11% for 3-4 years; and 7% for 1-2 years. He uses this chart as his proof that the welfare system inhumanely discourages work and breeds a culture of poverty and dependency.

During the second section of his speech, RS touches on four major points. First, he exhibits a chart of 'Poverty discourages work and breeds a culture of poverty and dependency.

During the second section of his speech, RS touches on four major points. First, he exhibits a chart of 'Poverty discourages work and breeds a culture of poverty and dependency.

During the second section of his speech, RS touches on four major points. First, he exhibits a chart of 'Poverty Rates for Families with Children by Number of Workers, 1990'. The chart's figures show that 86% of families with no workers live below the poverty line, while only 23% with one worker, 6% with one full-time worker, 5% with 2 or more workers and 1% with 2 or more full-time workers are poor. His analysis: "work pays", no matter what people say about the poor wages, part-time work, and lack of benefits associated with today's entry-level jobs. The implication is that the nation's welfare problems stem from the corrupting influence of receiving money without work, rather than a lack of employment opportunity. The basic problem that needs to be faced in moving people off

welfare, according to RS, is how to ensure that families have at least one full-time worker.

RS then addresses the problem of single-parent families and illegitimate children, which as he sees it is fundamentally intertwined with welfare problems. He cites a number of statistics on illegitimate births - in 1950 4% of children were born out of wedlock, while today the figure is at 30%. In the African-American community the number has risen to 68%, and in the white community it's growing even faster, reaching 22%. He points out that having illegitimate children puts a mother at high risk of ending up on welfare, especially if she is a minor. To illustrate this connection, he uses a chart which depicts both the rise of illegitimate births and the rise of welfare payments. The two lines are close together, appearing to mirror each other almost perfectly in their steady uphill climb. His corollary point is that while the mothers and children are ending up on welfare, the fathers are joining gangs instead of raising families. RS sees a plan to slow illegitimate births as a sine qua non for a decent welfare reform plan.

Next RS uses welfare for drug and alcohol abusers under the SSI program as an example of the excesses of the current welfare system. He rails against the corruption and expansion of a well-intentioned system to incorporate the subsidization of illegal or at least disapproved behavior. In front of a chart illustrating the figures, he claims that the government spends \$300 million on welfare for drug addicts. In addition, he claims that the Social Security Administrator testified that only 3% of drug and alcohol abusers on SSI are in treatment although it is a supposed requirement. Moreover, the Administrator testified, according to RS, that not one drug or alcohol abuser has ever successfully left the program rehabilitated. Finally, a GAO report found that many of the SSI checks were being mailed to drug dealers and bartenders.

Finally, he attacks the payment of welfare benefits to immigrant non-citizens, backed up by a chart illustrating that non-citizens cost the taxpayer \$7 billion in welfare costs, including 400,000 immigrant mothers with children on AFDC, 500,000 elderly and disabled non-citizens on SSI and other programs, 750,000 poor on food stamps, and 950,000 poor on non-citizens cost the taxpayer \$7 billion in welfare costs, including 400,000 immigrant mothers with children on AFDC, 500,000 elderly and disabled non-citizens on SSI and other programs, 750,000 poor on food stamps, and 950,000 poor on Medicaid. He complains that many immigrants are coming to the US for welfare not to live the American dream.

Finally, RS outlines his solutions. He would require work for welfare benefits after two years, either for government or private sector work programs. This would serve as a tool to enhance work ethic and deter people from remaining on the dole. To combat the expense of illegitimate births, RS would require the submission to the government of the name of the child's father, or else cut off benefits. This would require the father to play a role in raising the child. In addition, RS's plan would cut off all cash benefits to minors who have children, forcing them to remain with their parents

(the provision of food stamps and Medicare would continue). To lower costs and enhance the efficiency of SSI for drug and alcohol abusers, the plan would require periodic drug tests. Any failure would result in discontinuation of all benefits, except the drug treatment program. And to cut costs, the plan would force sponsors of immigrants, rather than the federal government, to bear financial responsibility for those they sponsor, until they become full US citizens.

As a result of these reforms and others, RS claims that his bill would make welfare more effective and more humane. It would reestablish welfare as a temporary program, while putting emphasis on the American values of work and personal responsibility. And it would save the taxpayer \$20 billion over five years. By contrast, he points out, the Clinton draft proposal would cost an additional \$15 billion over the same period. Moreover, he claims, his program would put around 50% of welfare recipients to work over 5 years, as compared to the Clinton proposal's less than 5%.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Location: Meadville
Crawford County Courthouse
Date: 03/28/94, 11:30AM
Attendance: 5 people
Media: Meadville Tribune, radio station

Comments:

RS introduced himself to each of the people who showed for this meeting. He immediately asked me for what/whom I was taping the meeting. My answer didn't appear to faze him, but it did cool off his previously amiable demeanor. He launched directly into a quick version of his stump welfare reform speech, now taking on a very business-like air.

He began by describing the development of his welfare reform proposal, his status as the Ranking GOP Member of the Human Resources Subcomm, the Republican leadership's request for him to develop a bill, etc. He then estimated the chances of the bill's passage as extremely good, particularly because of the similarity in welfare reform ideas being forwarded by the Mainstream Democratic Forum led by Rep. McCurdy. In fact, he predicted that if a vote were held tomorrow, the bill would pass both the Senate and the House, with strong bipartisan support.

He then began his analysis of the problems and possible solutions regarding today's welfare system. He followed his standard welfare speech format, described in a 03/31 memo. The following are a number of highlight quotes:

On work and personal responsibility: "I mean we owe it to the taxpayers to ah to fulfill the social contract that, that we're willing to help people, but only if people are willing to help themselves. And at some point, they need to give back to the community that's providing them the hand up."

On illegitimacy and welfare spending: "Ah, the reason we have this other line here (welfare spending line on chart #2) is to show the relationship between illegitimacy and welfare spending. The more illegitimacy the more we spend on welfare. There's a very direct tie: 80% of children who have children, 80 % of teenagers who have children end up on welfare within five years. Ah, it's a one-way ticket to poverty, ah when you have ah children born out of wedlock."

Crawford County Courthouse
Date: 03/28/94, 11:30AM
Attendance: 5 people
Media: Meadville Tribune, radio station

Comments:

RS introduced himself to each of the people who showed for this meeting. He immediately asked me for what/whom I was taping the meeting. My answer didn't appear to faze him, but it did cool off his previously amiable demeanor. He launched directly into a quick version of his stump welfare reform speech, now taking on a very business-like air.

growing feeling in Washington, DC, ah among the ah sort of the conservative ah thinkers to ah – it was written actually, it was an article written by a guy from the Enterprise Institute, a guy named Charles Murray... (aside about his laryngitis)...

The ah, the, the thinking goes: that the reason we've had an explosion of illegitimacy in this country is because we subsidize it. It used to be 40 years ago, if you had a child out of wedlock, I mean it not only wasn't a socially acceptable thing, ah but y'know there was not, there was nothing there to provide any support for that child, and so it was a very tough economic decision ah on the part of, on the part of the family and it, and it had some dire consequences. Well that isn't the case anymore. We've made it easier, because we pay for Moms who have children. Ah we, you have a child out of wedlock you get your medical bills paid for, you get the cash assistance, about 45 hundred bucks a year, you get ah medical assistance, plus you get food stamps. Total package comes to around, depending on the state, 12 to 14000 dollars a year for having a child. Well, if you're someone who's not working, someone who maybe is a high school dropout, someone who doesn't see much of a future: not a bad option, ah in some cases. So what Murray has suggested is that we are, we are in fact encouraging behavior we don't want, that we know is in fact destructive. And so what we should do is cut off all welfare benefits to ah to any child who, ah child and mother who has a child out of wedlock. Ah, that's a great theory; I'm not too sure in practice that works all that well. Ah, it makes the assumption that people have children be-, because they want money. Ah, and that's not obviously the motivation to why most people have children. I will accept the argument that we certainly have made it easier for that decision to be made. There's no question about that. We've made it easier," He continued to say that his bill would test the theory by cutting off cash benefits only to teenage mothers, who could fall back on their families for financial support.

On the reasons illegitimate mothers don't identify their children's fathers: "One of the things that is so important in the cases of, of welfare Dads is that we have ah over 50% of the children, who are on welfare, ah who are born to single Moms, don't know who their fathers are. And it's not because Mom doesn't know who the fathers are; it's a fallacy to think that Mom y'know is having sexual relationships with so many people that she doesn't know who Dad is. That just simply isn't the case. The, the vast, vast, vast majority of Moms know who Dad is, but it makes no sense for them to tell the government who Dad is. Why? Because if they tell the government who Dad is, then the government tracks down Dad and gets child support orders and Mom has to go through the hassle of collecting child support from Dad, and in most cases Dad's not being the most responsible person, so it's a big financial burden to Mom. It's a lot easier to just say you don't know child out of wedlock, I mean it not only wasn't a socially acceptable thing, an but y'know there was not, there was nothing there to provide any support for that child, and so it was a very tough economic decision ah on the part of, on the part of the family and it, and it had some dire consequences. Well that isn't the case anymore. We've made it easier, because we pay for Moms who have children. Ah we, you have a child out of wedlock you get your medical bills paid for, you get the cash assistance, about 45 hundred bucks a year, you get ah medical assistance, plus you get food stamps. Total package comes to around, depending on the state, 12 to 14000 dollars a year for having a child. Well, if you're someone who's not working, someone who maybe is a high school dropout, someone who doesn't see much of a future: not a bad option, ah in some cases. So what Murray has suggested is that we are, we are in fact encouraging behavior we don't want, that we know is in fact destructive. And so what we should do is cut off all welfare benefits to ah to any

On his work program solution: "Finally, work. We adopt what candidate Clinton said he wanted to do, but what President Clinton has so far failed to do, which is to put a time limitation on welfare of two years."

On Clinton's draft proposal, linking HW in with the President: "And ah, unfortunately you have the, the ah the Harris Woffords of this world and now it appears the Bill Clintons ah who simply just don't want to change the system. They think the problem is not ah structural; they think the problem's resources. And, and Clinton proves this out because what Clinton has done in his bill is spend 15 billion dollars more money -- we save 20 billion -- he spends 15 billion over the same period of time: 5 years. 14 billion of it is in, are in new welfare programs, and spends 820 million dollars over 5 years on work programs. We spend 6 billion dollars on work programs -- he spends less than a billion; we get 50% of the people in the work programs within 5 years -- he gets less than 5% of the people in the work programs after 5 years. His program is a joke. It's not real; there's no reform. It doesn't end welfare as we know it, it expands welfare as we know it. But what he'll tell you, and I suspect the Harris Woffords who are filming this thing is what they'll tell is 'Oh, this really does change things'. It's just not true. They doesn't change anything. It's token, it's token, so they can use the rhetoric, but it's not real in giving people opportunity to get out of welfare."

On welfare programs as America's true area of crisis: "In fact, an amazing thing is everyone's so focused on health care -- health care a very important issue -- ah I would suggest to you that the welfare system is in much more crisis than any other system that we have in the country. Welfare ha-, I mean health care ah is, has its problems, but you compare what we've done to people on welfare, what we've done to the inner city in America, what we've done to the families, what we've done to individuals, and how we -- and you want to talk about absolute crisis. Why are people afraid to ah, to go into cities anymore? The root cause of the crime problem in this country is right here. We've destroyed families; we've destroyed communities. And y'know, anyone who says we can solve the crime problem without addressing the welfare problem's crazy."

On overlap between welfare reform and health care reform and job development: "The health care issue overlaps on the welfare issue. I mean having, we have to have, we have to have health care reform to provide subsidies for low-

On overlap between welfare reform and health care reform and job development: "The health care issue overlaps on the welfare issue. I mean having, we have to have, we have to have health care reform to provide subsidies for low-

On overlap between welfare reform and health care reform and job development: "The health care issue overlaps on the welfare issue. I mean having, we have to have, we have to have health care reform to provide subsidies for low-income people so they can afford insurance so they aren't trapped on welfare because they're afraid of losing their health insurance."

"Ah, the economic development plat-, platform that we're running on, im-, impacts this, that you have to have jobs and opportunity ah for people to not end up in work programs so they will in fact find jobs before they, before they reach the work program."

On reasons people go on welfare and what his proposal will do to discourage them: "You're sitting in high school, and you think 'Well, y'know, I, I end up on welfare and so what, I'll stay on welfare the rest of my life'. Now, you know, you can't stay on welfare the rest of your life; you gotta, you gotta be a little

ah, but having a strong economic development package is absolutely necessary if we're gonna do something about it..."

On HW and his quiet role in the health care reform process: "Well, I mean, the reason I, I think you see Harris Wofford not on the front lines is because he's contributed virtually nothing in the way of ideas to the plan. I mean, this, ah this was some-, this was a political ploy on the part of, of ah, ah Jim Carville and Harris Wofford to get votes, not something that he had invested a lot of time and energy and researching as to what the needs were and the solutions were to the health care problems in this country. So ah, I mean, you're basically asking an academic to fix the car. Ah, and he's not, he's not someone who knows anything about how the car works or how, how to repair what's in the car. Ah, you're looking and talking to someone who, who's seen some nice ah, y'know, blueprints, and, and likes the pictures he sees in magazines of what the car looks like, but couldn't tell you how to build it or how it works. And so what they've done is they've -- the people who've taken the time to learn about the issue, taken the time to grip, ah, ah and put the investment of time and energy ah in developing solutions are the people who are leading the debate now. He obviously is not one of them. What he's done is been pretty much a lapdog. He's just (unintell.) whatever Clinton says, and has been ah, y'know, one of the real blind followers of, of the Clinton plan on health care, which is ah I think not going to serve him very well in the not too distant future, when that plan ah gets scuttled for something less big government, less intrusive, ah and ah and much more progressive and, and ah helpful to the state of Pennsylvania, ah not getting health insurance today."

Overview: A pretty unexciting meeting, with the exception of the attack on HW for his low profile on health care reform. This is an important problem that I've been seeing around the state. People see HW as being elected to reform health care, but nobody's heard much since. Many people ask 'what's the Wofford plan?' Because there's no plan with his name on it, they think that he hasn't had an impact on the health care debate. RS can claim the MediSave plan as the Santorum plan. But all people see of HW is him shaking hands with Administration officials at health care events, and they think he's just jumping on someone else's bandwagon rather than playing an integral role.

RS's aide took my and Tim's names as well as asking where we worked, which we both told him truthfully. He wrote it all down scrupulously, probably providing for the later press release.

Noone that we talked to in Meadville outside the event seemed to know ~~his name took my and Tim's names as well as asking where we worked~~ which we both told him truthfully. He wrote it all down scrupulously, probably providing for the later press release.

Noone that we talked to in Meadville outside the event seemed to know that RS was coming. Perhaps when he begins to claim to know the interests and needs of Pennsylvanians because of these town meetings, we could point out that ~~this was some-, this was a political ploy on the part of, of ah, ah Jim Carville and Harris Wofford to get votes~~ not something that he had invested a lot of time and energy and researching as to what the needs were and the solutions were to the health care problems in this country. So ah, I mean, you're basically asking an academic to fix the car. Ah, and he's not, he's not someone who knows anything about how the car works or how, how to repair what's in the car. Ah, you're looking and talking to someone who, who's seen some nice ah, y'know, blueprints, and, and likes the pictures he sees in magazines of what the car looks like, but couldn't tell you how to build it or how it works. And so what they've done is they've -- the people who've taken the time to learn about the issue, taken the time to grip, ah, ah and put the investment of time and energy ah in developing solutions are the people who are leading the debate now. He obviously is not one of them. What he's done is been pretty much a lapdog. He's just (unintell.) whatever Clinton

Memo

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Date: 03/25
Re: RS 3/19 Town Meetings

1st Meeting

Location: Seton LaSalle High School, in the southern Greater Pittsburgh area.

Date, time: 03/19/94, 9:00 AM.

Type: Constituent town meeting.

Subject: Multi-issue,.

Sponsor: None.

Crowd: 35-40 people, many Senior Citizens.

Media: None noticed.

Comments: RS began with a quick presentation of 'what's happening in DC'. He discussed the 1994 budget, panning the Clinton plan as a continuation of the status quo without new spending cuts. He then lauded the Kasich Republican budget, claiming it would have cut \$150 billion in spending beyond the Clinton plan. He went into great detail about the Family Tax Credit of \$500 per child above the present \$2650. "We thought this credit was a great idea. It's a way, was a way of, sort of, giving back to families. Some of the money we've been taking from you over the years." He cites his favorite statistics: 1) that if you took the family tax credit in 1950 and indexed it to inflation, it would be over \$8000 per child rather than \$2650; and 2) that in 1950, the average American family paid 2% of its income to the federal govt, while today it pays 24%. RS loves this tax credit because it allows him to be pro-family and anti-govt. at the same time.

He then discussed the progress of the Clinton health reform bill, gloating over the fact that Chairman Stark had not introduced the President's bill to the Health subcomm. of Ways and Means. He characterized Stark's Medicare Part C bill as a "back-door single-payer" plan; as he put it: "if you create a government program and all the uninsured are in it... Well, what's the incentive for businesses to continue

1st Meeting

Location: Seton LaSalle High School, in the southern Greater Pittsburgh area.

Date, time: 03/19/94, 9:00 AM.

Type: Constituent town meeting.

Subject: Multi-issue,.

Sponsor: None.

Crowd: 35-40 people, many Senior Citizens.

Media: None noticed.

Comments: RS began with a quick presentation of 'what's happening in DC'. He discussed the 1994 budget,

regulation when our economy needs the opposite. He also predicted that the Clinton health care plan would impose crushing mandates on small businesses.

Social Security: The first question was on the Notch Bills and Social Security. RS first stated his position on Notch that he would consider paying Notch babies social security only if the payments were financed by spending cuts: "I'm not going to vote for any bill that's not paid for." He pointed out that this was his principle across the board, leading him to make unpopular votes like the one against flood relief. When questioned again about Social Security later in the meeting, he launched into a tirade about the inefficiency of government programs, citing the facts that the Social Security Disability program will be bankrupt within two or three years and the Social Security administration itself will be bankrupt by 2025. This plays into his health care position that government will be less efficient and cost-effective at running a health care system than the private sector.

Balanced Budget Amendment: He used a question on this amendment to attack the President's claim that the deficit is decreasing under his 1993 and 1994 budgets. He maintained that it is only decreasing because the S&L bailout made the deficit unnaturally high in the last years of the Bush Administration. He then attacked the President for his tax raise, claiming that tax hikes on the rich affect the whole economy adversely by taking money out of circulation and private investment. He uses the luxury tax on boats as his example: "What happened? Well, rich people don't have to buy boats. Guess what, they didn't. So what happened? We basically destroyed the boat-building business in this country... Do rich people work in those boat factories? No..." He claimed that the luxury tax actually resulted not only in job loss, but as a result in lower tax revenues.

Health Care: RS began his presentation by unveiling a chart of the Clinton plan much like the one used by Senator Dole after the President's health care speech, picturing the new health care system. He referred to the Clinton plan as "an enormous bureaucratic entity: 60 new federal agencies .. chart of the Clinton plan much like the one used by Senator Dole after the President's health care speech, picturing the new health care system. He referred to the Clinton plan as "an enormous bureaucratic entity: 60 new federal agencies, 98000 new federal jobs...", employing the C.B.O. estimate that it will enlarge the deficit by \$75 billion over 5 cuts: "I'm not going to vote for any bill that's not paid for." He pointed out that this was his principle across the board, leading him to make unpopular votes like the one against flood relief. When questioned again about Social Security later in the meeting, he launched into a tirade about the inefficiency of government programs, citing the facts that the Social Security Disability program will be bankrupt within two or three years and the Social Security administration itself will be bankrupt by 2025. This plays into his health care position that government will be less efficient and cost-effective at running a health care system than the private sector.

Balanced Budget Amendment: He used a question on this

strengths of the present system in high-quality care while curtailing costs and providing greater access.

One segment in which he differed from his standard text was during his comparison of Pennsylvania's low uninsurance rate of 8.4% to Hawaii's rate of between 8 and 11 %. He even goes as far as to extrapolate that the uninsurance rate could go up in Pennsylvania if the Clinton plan is implemented. Moreover, in analyzing the reasons behind Pennsylvania's low rates, he outlines the core of his health care plan. While he admits that Pennsylvania's older population lowers the uninsurance rate, he attributes the low rate mainly to Pennsylvania Blue Cross's guarantee of right-of-renewal and exclusion of pre-existing condition clauses: "Those two things alone cut our insurance, ah our insurance rate in half."

Overview: This was a quiet meeting. The great majority of attendees were Senior Citizens who did not ask particularly pointed questions. RS did pretty well, but lacked the fiery rhetoric and emotion, he showed later in the day. The meeting was a lot shorter than the later one as well.

implemented. Moreover, in analyzing the reasons behind Pennsylvania's low rates, he outlines the core of his health care plan. While he admits that Pennsylvania's older population lowers the uninsurance rate, he attributes the low rate mainly to Pennsylvania Blue Cross's guarantee of right-of-renewal and exclusion of pre-existing condition clauses: "Those two things alone cut our insurance, ah our insurance rate in half."

Overview: This was a quiet meeting. The great majority of attendees were Senior Citizens who did not ask particularly pointed questions. RS did pretty well, but lacked the fiery rhetoric and emotion, he showed later in the day. The meeting was a lot shorter than the later one

TO: Stuart
FROM: Scott

Washington, PA
3/14/94 3:45 P.M.
Town Meeting
Welfare Reform
Davy Songer Inc.
Approximately 40, mostly white collar employees
Highly Favorable
Local Press - The Washington Observer Reporter

Yet another in the tradition of Santorum Town Meetings held for white people in suits as opposed to local folks in boots. The Washington area is a perfect model of Southwestern PA as a small city nestled by a rural poor working class community. The crowd filling the room at Davy Songer Inc. did not make it necessary for RS to appeal to a broad constituency.

A dramatic difference between this event and others was the increase in Rick's anxiety level as I walked into the room. After the day's previous event in Uniontown it was obvious that Santorum had recognized me. He made a concerted effort to avoid the question of a friend who walked into the conference room with me. The theme was typical of welfare town meetings that are energized by hostility toward Senator Wofford and The Clinton Administration and views the Washington democratic landscape as responsible for the pitfalls of Welfare. RS makes a great effort to influence the perception of the audience of these events as a part of the overall theme. First comes the problem, then the solution and the fit between the two is better tailored than a Fritz Hollings suit. Rick also tried to play the media at this event by suggesting that the media across the country was giving his plan favorable reviews, but the papers in Pennsylvania have yet to notice his plan.

~~Santorum made reference to the media circus surrounding the President for the first time at one of these sessions. "This is something we can do if the President's of a mind to try to do it. And I think that as scandals start to surface a little bit more and~~

~~Santorum made reference to the media circus surrounding the President for the first time at one of these sessions. "This is something we can do if the President's of a mind to try to do it. And I think that as scandals start to surface a little bit more and health care starts to disintegrate, this could be something he could tie himself to. you know this could be a lifeline." Santorum Davy Songer Inc.~~

Approximately 40, mostly white collar employees
Highly Favorable
Local Press - The Washington Observer Reporter

Yet another in the tradition of Santorum Town Meetings held for white people in suits as opposed to local folks in boots. The Washington area is a perfect model of Southwestern PA as a small city nestled by a rural poor working class community. The crowd filling the room at Davy Songer Inc. did not make it necessary for RS to appeal to a broad constituency.

The tough talk was strong here as it typically is in the corporate like environment. This is a core constituency for Rick, remembering that these people all have jobs and that they are doing fairly well. The effort to reach out to Democrats was effective in that at the same time he slammed HW. New Democrats have an understanding of the need for change BC and HW are not and therefore they do not hope to change behavior. Continuing from "they believe in big government", "you see what you'll get are the New Democrats, the folks who believe we have to change the structure of naming responsible behavior and setting forward incentives to do the responsible thing and penalizing the irresponsible. If you have for example, If you have a child on welfare, If you're on welfare now and you're a single mom and you have another child while on welfare - no additional benefits."

Santorum showed that he was capable of talking tough on the subject of food stamps as well and he expressed interest in drastic changes in the delivery of the food stamp program. He did though voice approval for the concept of a food stamp program as an effort to improve access to food for the poor. "The food stamp program has been expanded a lot in recent years and I have - I think the food stamp program is a good program in the sense that it targets. We should help people who are lower income be able to buy food but the problem is with the fraud that is rampant in the food stamp program and people who are using food stamps. I mean. I can't tell you the number of people that tell me they walk through the line and someone ahead of them is getting - has food stamps and they're eatin better than they are and they are working for a living and you know don't have any assistance at all. Um - one of the things we can do. Two ideas and I - um - both of them, neither of them are in this bill but are going to be included in a companion bill, and I'm on both measures for - I've co-sponsored the other measures. A - one is to fingerprint, New York State is doing this and I think its going - were probably going to end up doing this all over the place and its. You wanna come in and become eligible for benefits and we'll fingerprint you. And places in which you use your government benefits whether its food stamps or whether its - you pick up your AFDC check you'll have to put a fingerprint on there to be able to receive it. Second thing is a debit card, a credit card instead of giving you stamps you'll get a debit card use your government benefits whether its food stamps or whether its - you pick up your AFDC check you'll have to put a fingerprint on there to be able to receive it. Second thing is a debit card, a credit card instead of giving you stamps you'll get a debit card with information as to how much food you're getting and how much is available on your card. And in combination with the fingerprint we pretty much solve a lot of the problem because you have to present the card plus the fingerprint to show that that's your card. And we think that those are the kinds of control systems that are necessary to prevent a lot of the fraud and make sure that people who are in need of it actually get it." Could this really be happening in New York. Marshall is having his brother who works for Carolyn Maloney (of New York) find out if this is correct or another Santoriam fantasy.

Rick feels very confident about his Welfare reform proposal

benefits plus minimum wage comes to about 16 grand. That's more than the roughly 12 or 13 thousand that you get if you're on Welfare, so it already pays to work the problem is its very difficult for these people in many cases move off because its very - its scary. And so what we have to do in some cases is just give a little shove up and its - and its - and its it is the most compassionate thing we can do. Its become a way of life (from the crowd) its become a way of life, they know no different and its compassionate to move these people out. Because if you leave them were they are they will simply be there the rest of their life and we're not doing these people any favors and its a bunch of false hooey compassion to say - a - we don't want to help these people. Keeping people poor does not help them and that is what this system does."

Santorum makes reference to sitting down with some Democratic members ie Dave McCurdy to discuss bipartisan efforts at reforming the Welfare system. He also refers to Harold Ford Chairman of the Human Resources subcommittee as well as Speaker Foley. These are the people who created the welfare system and RS believes they will make no effort to reform it. He expresses the view that his welfare plan could pass but he does not know if he will be able to get it to the floor.

crowd) its become a way of life, they know no different and its compassionate to move these people out. Because if you leave them were they are they will simply be there the rest of their life and we're not doing these people any favors and its a bunch of false hooey compassion to say - a - we don't want to help these people. Keeping people poor does not help them and that is what this system does."

Santorum makes reference to sitting down with some Democratic members ie Dave McCurdy to discuss bipartisan efforts at reforming the Welfare system. He also refers to Harold Ford Chairman of the Human Resources subcommittee as well as Speaker Foley. These are the people who created the welfare system and RS believes they will

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Location: New Bloomfield
Perry County Courthouse
Date: 04/01/94, 2:00 PM
Attendance: 10 people, mostly supporters
Media: Perry County Times

Comments:

The Perry County Republican Committee Chairman introduced RS very enthusiastically. RS immediately launched into his standard welfare reform speech, introducing himself as the Ranking Republican on the Human Resources subcommittee of the W&M Committee and the drafter of the Republican welfare reform proposal. He discussed two Democratic proposals being developed - the President's and that of the Mainstream Democratic Forum. Again, he claimed that the Forum's proposal would look much like his own, and passage of a compromise bill would only depend on discharging a bill from committee and whether the President would exercise his veto.

The meeting was pretty short, and the ensemble was very Republican and very pro-Santorum. The following quotes were the highlights of the meeting:

On America's true crisis: "So we're, we're very encouraged that we can get a bipartisan coalition together to do something positive to really address what ah, what really is a crisis in our country, and that is the crisis of the inner cities, and of crime, and of poverty, and, and all of those things which revolve, in my mind, around, and I think in most people's minds, the, the issue of welfare."

Comparing himself to Perot: "Let me run through my Perot presentation here, using charts. It can work for that little guy, it can work for me."

On Dan Quayle and illegitimacy, one of RS's favorite little stories: "Number 2: America's dirty little secret, that we have been hesitating to talk about for years and years and years in this country, but has reached such crisis proportions that even, ah even the liberals are beginning to recognize that little stories: "Number 2: America's dirty little secret, that we have been hesitating to talk about for years and years and years in this country, but has reached such crisis proportions that even, ah even the liberals are beginning to recognize that little stories: "Number 2: America's dirty little secret, that we have been hesitating to talk about for years and years and years in this country, but has reached such crisis proportions that even, ah even the liberals are beginning to recognize that the problem of out-of-wedlock births, illegitimacy, is a serious problem that must be addressed in our society, and that ah, the guy who first brought this idea before the American public, a guy by the name of Quayle ah, who was ostracized by Hollywood, and by the media for bringing this up, ah and, was in fact, as the Atlantic monthly said about a year ago in one of their cover stories when they had a picture of Dan Quayle on the front of it with the cover story that read: "Dan Quayle was right." Ah, what Dan Quayle did was ah, use the wrong example, because if everybody here [points at illegitimacy rate] was

Murphy Brown, we wouldn't have the problem that we have today. But these aren't Murphy Browns having these children. There are a few in there, but the vast majority of these folks are folks who are single Moms, who are having children out of wedlock who simply can't affo-, who can't afford ah, to be able to raise those children without resorting in many cases to welfare."

On Clinton's political game of claiming he's a new Democrat, but acting like an old-fashioned liberal, using welfare reform and the budget as examples: "That's his [Clinton's] solution -- more welfare, and, and he'll run around and say: 'Oh, I'm being tough; I'm gonna put people to work.' He's gonna put virtually nobody to work. It'll be 30 years before people will have to work in this program. I mean, the fact of the matter is he will, he's doing it, he's putting a very small work program together to do what he always does: to get up here and says he's doing something, when in fact he's not doing anything. Y'know, he says: 'Oh, I've got spending cuts in my budget bill.' Yet if you look at the Congressional Budget Office analysis of his, of his budget bill, which he says is 500 billion, and I know Harris you say the same thing, when it doesn't, it's not 500 billion -- use the C.B.O. numbers, 433 billion. 433 billion is the C.B.O. number, 433 billion of which 2, I think it's 270, 265, 270 is what? Tax increases. So, I mean, it's not, i-, he's, said 'Oh, it's a dollar for dollar' -- it's not even close. Most of it is tax increases -- most of it -- the spending cuts don't come until later years, and th-, and the biggest part of the spending cuts are savings on interest payments. So, it, y'know, it's, the whole concept that he, he doesn't focus on the truth, he tells you what you wanna hear. What he wi-, what he's gonna focus on in this bill is it's gonna make people work. Remember, it doesn't."

On why Moms will give the correct father's name: "And ah we say to Mom that you tell us the wrong name, ah and we'll bring that guy in and we'll do a blood test and that's not Dad, you lose your welfare benefits. You lose your welfare benefits, until, not 'til you tell us another name, but 'til we find out who Dad is, we establish it. So there's a very, a very strong incentive to tell us the right name, because if you tell us the wrong name, and it's wrong, you lose your benefits until we find out what the ri-, I mean as most of you probably know, it takes some time to establish who, who the father is, in a very strong incentive to tell us the right name, because if you tell us the wrong name, and it's wrong, you lose your benefits until we find out what the ri-, I mean as most of you probably know, it takes some time to establish who, who the father is, in a very strong incentive to tell us the right name, because if you tell us the wrong name, and it's wrong, you lose your benefits until we find out what the ri-, I mean as most of you probably know, it takes some time to establish who, who the father is in some cases, and ah that, ah because you have to find them and then, and then do the testing. So ah, it can take some time, and Mom has that risk." Can the government just bring in a host of men named by women on AFDC and blood test them What if one of them named RS as the father, and he had to be tested?

On fathers of welfare children: "... what we do if, if Dad doesn't have money is ah, a couple of things. First off, it's somewhat of a fallacy to believe that Dad doesn't have money and (unintell.) studies done about fathers who have children on welfare, and they have an average income nationwide

of about 15,000 dollars a year. So it's not, and obviously no-one's gonna be getting rich on 15000 dollars a year, but it's enough money to pay some child support. And that's, and that's something that y'know we, we focus on: you should pay at least what you're able to pay. Ah, number one. And number two, ah, it's very simple. We say to fathers who, who ah refuse to work to support your children and we'll put them in a work program and make them work, ah work off, ah their child support benefits, their child support payments." Where did he get that figure? Even if that figure is not inflated, will it save the government money to build up an institutional structure committed to finding fathers and making them pay or work?

On trackers and politics: "Well the thing is, I mean y'know it's really actually sort of nice having, having the, the Senator at our, at every one of my meetings, ah because the, the thing that he'll find is that y'know I say this in Perry County, and I say it in Philadelphia County, and I say it in Allegheny County, and I say it in Harrisburg, and I say it everywhere else. Ah, y'know, I don't change my tune based on where I am, and um, and that's what they're trying to do, and y'know they'll, they'll find some, y'know, five-word phrase that I said that sounds like I'm a barbarian, and, and try to use that to, to twist around, saying y'know 'Oh, he's a terrible right-wing radical' and, and, y'know whatever ah, kind of ah, kind of person. But, but that's, but that's the tactic, and if you don't have any ideas. if you don't have anything to really, ah that really you can go out and sell to the public, that's what you have to do, that's the tactic you take, is you tear down somebody else, so that, and, and not really go out and, and offer ideas that really solve problems. And, ah, y'know so I welcome that, and ah y'know have them catch me in my inconsistency, and ah, I, I hope they come to every one of those meetings. I hope they waste a lot of tape trying to do it. Ah, because that's, this guy's a good guy back there, taking the film, he could be effective out there on the campaign trail, and y'know, we, we, we think we're going to have, we're gonna start having car pools, that way we can save money, and -- it's very environmentally unsafe Senator to have these people travelling around with me wasting all this gas, when he could be riding with me. You could just make a small payment to my campaign, and we'd be happy to take him along, and [applause/laughter]. We'd be happy to do that." He tries these people travelling around with me wasting all this gas, when he could be riding with me. You could just make a small payment to my campaign, and we'd be happy to take him along, and [applause/laughter]. We'd be happy to do that." He tries to use my presence as a plug for his campaign -- that Democrats are nervous about his message, that HW has no agenda, etc.. He's not talking to very many people at this point, but should I try to keep a lower profile as his meetings grow in size and coverage?

Overview: Welfare reform went over pretty well with 10 Perry County Republicans. Those who attended asked softball questions and loved his responses. This brought out a little campaign feistiness and joviality in RS, hence the jokes about car pooling. RS tends to say more outrageous things if he is

either with a really supportive group or an antagonistic group. In this case, you could see that he enjoyed the support and it charged him up.

As with many places that I've followed RS, this was his second time through Perry County. We shouldn't underestimate the impression that that makes, especially in a county like Perry. Even if few people show for the meeting, he will be able to say to undecided voters in the county, 'I visited ___ times during the election.' People in the rural counties really seem to like that.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Subject: RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Location: Williamsport Wire Rope Co.
Maynard Street, Williamsport, PA
Sponsored by company, introduced by manager
Date: 03/30/94, 9:30 AM
Attendance: 40+ people, mostly company employees, virtually all men.
Media: 2 radio reporters (WRAK, WILQ), 1 newspaper (Sun Gazette)

Comments:

Larry _____ (getting his name from local contact), the Williamsport Wire Co. President, introduced RS, lauding him as a Congressional reformer and a member of the Gang of 7. He also mentioned that RS had received national exposure on Larry King Live and the Phil Donahue Show. Do we have footage of these interviews? Did they happen? Or does Larry not know what he is talking about?

RS thanked Larry and launched into his standard welfare reform meeting presentation. He introduced himself as a Congressman on the Ways and Means Committee, chosen by the Republican leadership to draft the party's Welfare Reform plan. He pointed out that the plan not only has 160 GOP cosponsors, but in many areas appeals to Democrats as well, increasing its chance of passage. As he put it: "But the Democrats, ah sort of with what we term down in Washington the new, new Democrats, the folks who are, who recognize that government isn't the answer to every problem that comes down the pike, also are putting together a bill that ah that is ah that I think will be very similar to the one that I'm going to talk to you about today. And I very much believe what you're going to hear today and some of the solutions we're going to put forward today have a very good chance of being enacted into law certainly within the next year or so."

He then began the first segment of his presentation: and some of the solutions we're going to put forward today have a very good chance of being enacted into law certainly within the next year or so."

He then began the first segment of his presentation: the outlining of the problems in the welfare system. He began by pointing out that 65% of welfare recipients are on the

Date: 03/30/94, 9:30 AM
Attendance: 40+ people, mostly company employees, virtually all men.
Media: 2 radio reporters (WRAK, WILQ), 1 newspaper (Sun Gazette)

Comments:

Larry _____ (getting his name from local contact), the Williamsport Wire Co. President, introduced RS, lauding him as a Congressional reformer and a member of the Gang of 7. He also mentioned that RS had received national exposure on Larry

ah -- it shouldn't, it should be a safety net and not a fisherman's net which traps you and kills you and keeps you in there forever." The solution is work, and it's available if we rid the poor of the welfare system which drags them down into the cycle of poverty, RS maintained. "We need to ah get people into the workplace for one principal reason: you don't succeed in America if you don't work. If you don't work, you're very - - it's a -- you're pretty high likelihood that you're not going to succeed and you're gonna probably be poor. And we're not doing anybody any favor in America by just giving them money to stay poor. And that's exactly what we do in the welfare system."

He used his graph of family poverty rates by number of workers as evidence for this argument. The rate of poverty drops from 86% to 6% when one family member gets a full-time job. RS used this point not only to prove that "work pays", but to demonstrate that committed workers rise from low-paying jobs quickly to jobs that keep them above the poverty line. He finished this thought by saying: "So what we s-, what we believe is a solution is you have to get people from this column over here [families with no workers] into the workplace in order to succeed and to ah grab the opportunities there are in America."

In addressing the problems of illegitimacy, RS attempts to blame the welfare system for creating an American underclass. "If you look at where, where this number [illegitimacy rate] drop, starts to really go up -- 1965. What happened in 1965? Welfare programs were cut off. And when welfare in America really started to take off. The government started to come in and quote help people. Well, what happened since 1965? Now, 30% of all children born in this country are born out of wedlock -- 30%." He believes that welfare creates incentives for poor children to have children; by the same token, having children out of wedlock virtually ensures a spot on the welfare roll: "Well, welfare spending goes up as illegitimacy goes up. I mean, it makes sense. If you have a child out of wedlock, most cases you're going to end up on welfare. In fact, if you're, if you're a teenager who has a child out of wedlock, 80% of the time you end up on welfare. I mean, it's almost a certainty..."

He carefully points out that with the rate of white illegitimacy growing faster than in the African-American community, this is not simply a black problem. However, RS is I mean, it's almost a certainty..."

He carefully points out that with the rate of white illegitimacy growing faster than in the African-American community, this is not simply a black problem. However, RS is not above using some strong buzzwords -- like gangs and inner cities to get his message across. For example, in detailing to succeed and you're gonna probably be poor. And we're not doing anybody any favor in America by just giving them money to stay poor. And that's exactly what we do in the welfare system."

He used his graph of family poverty rates by number of workers as evidence for this argument. The rate of poverty drops from 86% to 6% when one family member gets a full-time job. RS used this point not only to prove that "work pays", but to demonstrate that committed workers rise from low-paying jobs quickly to jobs that keep them above the poverty line. He finished this thought by saying: "So what we s-, what we believe is a solution is you have to get people from this column over here [families with no workers] into the workplace in order to succeed and to ah grab the opportunities there are in America."

families as we did before. I mean, in 1960 ah the average American male spent 63% of their time with ah with a wife and children in the house -- 63% of their life. Today that average American male spends about 43% of their life with ah with a wife and children. And what that means is you have a bunch of young males going out and, particularly in the inner city, going out and instead of ah being in homes with a wife and a child, they're being with gangs, causing trouble. Because that's what young males do -- cause a lot of trouble, if they're not in, in relationships that stabilize them. So what we have here is a two- two-edged sword here where you're creating a problem of, of year after year, generation after generation of welfare, and generation after increasingly violent generation of, of, ah males who're causing trouble in our society. This is maybe the number one social problem in this country."

He then attacked the SSI system for giving benefits to drug and alcohol abusers, financing their habits. "Believe it or not, if you are so drug addicted or, or addicted to alcohol that you are, are out of it all the time, and you can't and you can't function, we pay you money. Ah, we actually give people money if they're so drug addicted or so alcoholic that they cannot perform any, if they cannot perform any tasks." Interestingly, in a departure from his usual text, RS also attacked SSI benefits for families with children suffering from Attention Deficit Disorders: "Well, the SSI program has sort of changed over the last 4 years. An, we've, we've sort of expanded it a little bit to cover a lot of people who certainly weren't originally intended to be covered. I talk about um, drug addicts that we now cover. Another area that I don't talk about very often are children ah who now get ah SSI because they have attention deficit disorders. These are kids who have a little trouble concentrating and, and focusing in the classroom. Well, if you, if, if your child has attention deficit, ah you can go to the disability office and you can get 450 dollars a month in SSI payments, cash. And you get your kid a Medicaid card. I mean, is that what this program was created to do? In my opinion, no."

In his section on cutting benefits to non-citizens, RS issues a somewhat anti-immigrant tone, especially for the son of an immigrant who discusses his heritage at the drop of a created to do? In my opinion, no."

In his section on cutting benefits to non-citizens, RS issues a somewhat anti-immigrant tone, especially for the son of an immigrant who discusses his heritage at the drop of a created to do? In my opinion, no."

In his section on cutting benefits to non-citizens, RS issues a somewhat anti-immigrant tone, especially for the son of an immigrant who discusses his heritage at the drop of a hat. Indeed, he made it sound like most immigrants were coming to America only for a welfare check: "Fine, you can come here and as long as you're under the immigration quotas, which they would be, you can come here and we'll give you the opportunity at the American dream that all of you in this room want. Ah, but, but we're not going to pay a welfare check to do that. What we're going to do is if you come here as a sponsored alien, someone who brings someone over, then the person who brings you here has responsibility to take care of you until you become a citizen. That if you're gonna bring someone over, you want someone to come to this country, it's now your

responsibility to take care of them, not the taxpayer, because you brought them here. We think it's a fairness issue. That saves a lot of money and it also, we think, will send a strong signal that America is the land of opportunity and not the land of the government benefit check."

During his synopsis of his bill's solutions to the welfare 'crisis', RS delivered his analysis of why young Americans have illegitimate children -- "Number 1, they get something that'll love them, and that's always important, ah important reason why a lot of children have children. Ah, but number 2 is because they get, they get a pretty big cash benefit."

After detailing the rest of his proposals for welfare reform, RS opened the floor for questions. The first questioner, apparently a plant worker, asked him if he had voted for the Striker Replacement bill and against NAFTA because of his constituency or because he wanted to run for Senate. What followed was an interesting exchange, which I will deliver in full:

- Question on NAFTA and Striker Replacement bill, voted out of conviction or to get elected?

"Ah, I represent a district that's ah, ah pretty, ah pretty unionized, pretty blue-collar, and ah, ah, ah represent that district in Congress accordingly. I also would say that that's an issue that, that ah, ah is important to me, that I would like to see something done on that issue. That it's not just because I represent my district, but it's something I believe needs to be done about it. Ah and I would support some sort of reform of that program as a Senator. I'm not ah, and I've said this before, the bill that passed I think has some problems with it. I voted for it because it was going to pass and I supported it. But I supported amendments to the bill, because I think it's, I mean it's ah, it's everything that organized labor could ever wish for is in that bill. Well, you don't get everything, you shouldn't get everything you wish for because I think it's probably a little bit too slanted in favor of labor as it currently sits. Ah and I would vote to amend it, to balance it out a little bit more, but ah I would support some sort of ah bill that would ah create ah some ah, some more equity as far as I can see with that subject."

- Interruption, question on which side RS would take if, to balance it out a little bit more, but ah I would support some sort of ah bill that would ah create ah some ah, some more equity as far as I can see with that subject."

- Interruption, question on which side RS would take if same bill came to Senate and there was a filibuster.

"On that particular item I would support on Americans have illegitimate children. Number 1, they get something that'll love them, and that's always important, ah important reason why a lot of children have children. Ah, but number 2 is because they get, they get a pretty big cash benefit."

After detailing the rest of his proposals for welfare reform, RS opened the floor for questions. The first questioner, apparently a plant worker, asked him if he had voted for the Striker Replacement bill and against NAFTA because of his constituency or because he wanted to run for Senate. What followed was an interesting exchange, which I will deliver in full:

- Question on NAFTA and Striker Replacement bill, voted out of conviction or to get elected?

that bill should become law. I think that something like that bill should. But I wouldn't vote for that bill if that were the final, ah final thing to do. I voted for it because I wanted it to move on and I wanted to see something done, and I talked to a lot of people in my district and in, in Pennsylvania and said 'Listen, you folks gotta sit at the table and work something out and quit standing over here and saying we want it all.' Because as long as you stand there and say you want it all, you're not going to get anything. Ah so, what, what I've suggested is that we ah try to work out something that's, that's ah, that's agreeable, that provides some protection to, to workers, but at the same time doesn't hamstring business to the point where it just becomes untenable for them to, to be able to, able to negotiate in good faith. So, ah, there has to be, just like everything else, folks, I mean you have to sit down and work out what's, what's adequate, what's capable and adequate for both sides."

- Follow-up, question on, in simplest terms, position on striker replacement. (RS getting frustrated by same questions)

"[more about need to bargain, compromise]... The bill that you guys put forward, frankly, is not a good bill for labor. Because what it'll do is probably shut down most businesses in this country. What you wanna do is -- Yeah it will -- what you wanna do is you wanna have something that's reasonable, that protects the problem, which is employers looking to replace workers because frankly they don't, they ah, they wanna cheaper work force, and that, and that maybe they wanna get rid of the union or something else -- that's a problem. But, but to, to put a blanket law that says 'Well, we're never going to be able to ever replace any work force under any circumstance', I mean, y'know that's just a little too extreme, and, and what we have to do is work out some -- I support you in concept. All I'm saying is y'know you don't want to go too far where you're gonna actually hurt yourself. And I think that bill as I've said before and I've said it in my district, that bill y'know I voted for it because I think the concept needs to be addressed; that bill, in my mind, is not a perfect bill."

The same worker then attacked on NAFTA as a popular and political vote. Some of the same circular talk occurred, with the concept needs to be addressed; that bill, in my mind, is not a perfect bill."

The same worker then attacked on NAFTA as a popular and political vote. Some of the same circular talk occurred, with RS getting frustrated. RS gets into a little argument with the questioner, telling him that he obviously hadn't read RS's question. Because as long as you stand there and say you want it all, you're not going to get anything. Ah so, what, what I've suggested is that we ah try to work out something that's, that's ah, that's agreeable, that provides some protection to, to workers, but at the same time doesn't hamstring business to the point where it just becomes untenable for them to, to be able to, able to negotiate in good faith. So, ah, there has to be, just like everything else, folks, I mean you have to sit down and work out what's, what's adequate, what's capable and adequate for both sides."

- Follow-up, question on, in simplest terms, position on striker replacement. (RS getting frustrated by same questions)

"[more about need to bargain, compromise]... The bill

Q "Noone's been talking to me about things..."

A "Well that's OK. The ah, my vote, my vote was very clear on NAFTA. I support free trade. I'll support the GATT agreement that, that's coming down. We're working very hard, by the way, for the steel industry in that case, ah with, with the GATT to make sure that industries like yours -- and I did the same thing on NAFTA, if you, if you'd do some research you'd find that I was one of the people on NAFTA, ah and I was on the Ways and Means Committee when that bill came through. I was one of the people who really worked very hard, unlike our Senator who I'm running against, Senator Wofford, who did nothing, even though we pleaded for him to try to help, he did nothing to try to help the steel industry in NAFTA. I gotta lot of steel in my district, and steel is a very important industry to this state, and there is nobody that goes to bat for the steel industry more than me, and you can ask, call the steel workers out in my district and find out what they think of Rick Santorum. All of them, the locals, endorsed Rick Santorum in the last election. Now your national won't, because they don't endorse anybody who doesn't have a D next to their name. But the folks who find out what the guy does who works, who saves, who helps save jobs down in his district, who works at the Clairton Coke Works to make sure that they have jobs there for steel workers. Ah, you talk to those folks down there and they'll tell you that I, I bust my butt every day and you can't get Harris Wofford to come within twenty miles of a steel plant. And, and the reason is you got someone who believes in making sure that America has good jobs. And we're working darn hard right now for the steel industry and with labor to try to get some amendments to the GATT agreement to make sure that imported steel doesn't get dumped in here and that we don't have, we don't have a situation where you're gonna lose American jobs because of this GATT agreement. Where's Harris Wofford? Nowhere. Nowhere."

Question - positions on gun control and crime control.

"The nice thing about this, this race for the Senate is you, you really have got folks who have two very different positions on just about every issue. Harris Wofford is very uh, y'know big for gun control. And I'm not. I very much believe in the 2nd Amendment, and I believe that people have, ah have the right to ah, to keep and bear arms, and that's what positions on just about every issue. Harris Wofford is very uh, y'know big for gun control. And I'm not. I very much believe in the 2nd Amendment, and I believe that people have, ah have the right to ah, to keep and bear arms, and that's what the Constitution guaranteed and they should read it the way it is. Ah and Harris Wofford has voted for the Brady Bill. I was on the Ways and Means Committee when that bill came through. I was one of the people who really worked very hard, unlike our Senator who I'm running against, Senator Wofford, who did nothing, even though we pleaded for him to try to help, he did nothing to try to help the steel industry in NAFTA. I gotta lot of steel in my district, and steel is a very important industry to this state, and there is nobody that goes to bat for the steel industry more than me, and you can ask, call the steel workers out in my district and find out what they think of Rick Santorum. All of them, the locals, endorsed Rick Santorum in the last election. Now your national won't, because they don't endorse anybody who doesn't have a D next to their name. But the folks who find out what the guy does who

the juvenile age in the United States down to 14 years of age, ah because y'know ah life has changed in America. 15 year-olds are no longer kids anymore in a lot of cases, and if they're murdering, murdering people, they should be treated like adults, um, because they're murdering like adults. Ah, those're the kind of things that you're going to find are very sharp differences between ah where Harris Wofford is and where I am.

Now you got some folks here that -- see the guy with the camera and the guy up front. Hi, good to see you. This guy, these are my buddies. They follow me around ah to every, every meeting I do, and they film every word I say, ah because they're from -- this is Jim Carville's best buddy. Jim Carville is, y'know, the President's guy who's also running Harris Wofford's campaign. Now this is a tactic they use in all of Carville's campaigns. What they do is they, they follow the candidate around and they film every word I say. And then what they do is they take a little snippet of what you're going to say, and they say 'See, this is what he said.' Ah, and so that's what you're gonna do -- but you guys were here. You heard what I had to say. You heard I'll answer the question. You answer, ask me a question, I'll give you a straight answer. I'm not gonna, I'm not gonna say one thing to you; if I go down to inner-city Philadelphia, I'm gonna answer that question the same way I just answered it to you, because you have a right to know the truth."

~~Question on work and welfare reform.~~ KS launched into an emotional speech on the value of work, ending with this quote: "I'm not out here because I think Rick Santorum is the greatest guy in the world, and y'know I need, I need people to tell me I'm great. I'm out here because I want my kids to have a suture in this country."

Question on small business: RS answers with attack on Clinton budget and lawyers:

"Number one, I think you're gonna see, ah probably over the next few years, particularly with, with this Clinton tax increase, I mean you're gonna hurt, that's just gonna kill jobs. I mean, you can say what you want, there isn't an economist from the farthest left to the farthest right who won't tell you when you increase taxes on people, you lose jobs..."

jobs. I mean, you can say what you want, there isn't an economist from the farthest left to the farthest right who won't tell you when you increase taxes on people, you lose jobs..."

"And I might add, my good friend -- Hello, there Senator -- I'll wave to the guy with the camera -- ah, hello

Now you got some folks here that -- see the guy with the camera and the guy up front. Hi, good to see you. This guy, these are my buddies. They follow me around ah to every, every meeting I do, and they film every word I say, ah because they're from -- this is Jim Carville's best buddy. Jim Carville is, y'know, the President's guy who's also running Harris Wofford's campaign. Now this is a tactic they use in all of Carville's campaigns. What they do is they, they follow the candidate around and they film every word I say. And then what they do is they take a little snippet of what you're going to say, and they say 'See, this is what he said.' Ah, and so that's what you're gonna do -- but you guys were here. You heard what I had to say. You heard I'll answer the question.

but there were few questions on the subject. More of the questions were on purely economic issues -- losing jobs to imports, labor issues, the economy. The other issue which appears to be worth watching in this Central Pennsylvania area is gun control; when RS answered that he was against gun control, it appeared to go over well. This impression was reinforced when I spoke to a couple of contacts in the area. They let me know that gun control was a major gripe in the area concerning Senator Wofford's voting record. Finally, worth noting from this meeting is that if you press RS, he will get combative and frustrated; I don't think his anger appears forceful and strong; instead he tends to belittle the questioner, saying things like "if you've read, and obviously you haven't..." We should try to exploit this.

concerning Senator Wofford's voting record. Finally, worth noting from this meeting is that if you press RS, he will get combative and frustrated; I don't think his anger appears forceful and strong; instead he tends to belittle the questioner, saying things like "if you've read, and obviously you haven't..." We should try to exploit this.

MEMO

Location: Jefferson County, Brookville. The Meeting Place
Restaurant

Date: 29 March 1994

Time: 8 AM

Type of meeting: Breakfast meeting for local Republicans

Sponsor: Jefferson County Republicans

Crowd Description: 30 people, primarily Republican,
including county legislator, sheriff, local
businessmen and women, several seniors

Media Coverage: none noticed

The presentation began differently than previous meetings. He began the meeting with an attack on Wofford. This meeting focused more on HW than any other meeting because of the primarily Republican audience. The rest of his presentation was the generic welfare reform speech that he clones from town to town.

RS began, "This is probably going to be the highest profile Senate election in the country. This campaign is going to be a very issue oriented campaign, at least I hope it is, because we are really dealing with two candidates who fundamentally believe different things, who have a very different perspective on their view of government. It's a race that I can tell you is getting national attention; it's a race I know that the Democrats are worried about."

He continued, "the curious thing is we try to do the same thing [sent opposition trackers] with Harris Wofford, but we find out, he isn't anywhere...He doesn't get out and around to very many places, so it's hard to find out what he is saying. We just sort of hear what he says in his press conferences in Washington, D.C. But that is really in essence part of the difference between Harris Wofford and myself."

RS attempted, in these opening remarks, to label HW as a Washington insider politician, and to label himself as a political outsider by referring to Congressmen as "they." He also boasted, "I am very much tuned in and understand what kind of needs that rural Pennsylvania has, and one of the things that I found most important is being there, just being there, just being out there and being involved. Because a lot of rural counties in the state, have frankly, been neglected by Washington D.C."

RS continued, "I am very much tuned in and understand what kind of needs that rural Pennsylvania has, and one of the things that I found most important is being there, just being there, just being out there and being involved. Because a lot of rural counties in the state, have frankly, been neglected by Washington D.C."

RS continued to attack HW by stating that HW represents the government of the past and is out of touch with today's issues. RS said, "Whoever wins this election will be up for

Crowd Description: 30 people, primarily Republican,
including county legislator, sheriff, local
businessmen and women, several seniors

Media Coverage: none noticed

The presentation began differently than previous meetings. He began the meeting with an attack on Wofford. This meeting focused more on HW than any other meeting because of the primarily Republican audience. The rest of his presentation was the generic welfare reform speech that he clones from town to town.

RS began, "This is probably going to be the highest profile Senate election in the country. This campaign is going to be a very issue oriented campaign, at least I hope it is, because we are really dealing with two candidates who

decisions for you, take more responsibility from you, should take more freedoms from you, so they can make decisions and manage your life better because they do it better than you. He really believes this stuff, and I give him a lot of credit for believing that because it's been somewhat discredited over the years. But this is a guy who holds firmly to those beliefs of the Great Society programs of Lyndon Johnson. And that government can, in fact, do good. And that is why I believe welfare is going to be an important issue."

Before beginning the welfare presentation, RS touched on health care. He spoke of big government under Clinton's health plan as controlling the lives of the American people. He went on to place HW further left on the political spectrum, possibly trying to utilize the "Liberal" label of the 1988 Presidential election. RS said, "If we do anything close to the Clinton Plan, or anything close to what Senator Wofford would like to be seen done...I mean, Wofford is even farther to the left than Clinton. And Wofford ideally would like to see government run the whole show. He's for a single payer approach to the problem."

RS went on to sarcastically speak on HW's point of view, "Pay the taxes to the government. You don't bother with these alliances...Because why do we need all these insurance companies, let's just illuminate them. Let's just have the government run the whole thing because its administratively more effective, and, of course, government is fairer than the private sector. ~~you know, these insurance companies are just in business to rip you off.~~ The government is there to be good to you. We need to get rid of all these folks who work in the private sector, and let the government run all this stuff. Well that's his view point. You may laugh...but this guy's serious."

RS then proceeded into his usual welfare reform presentation. He began by stating that the current system destroys American families. He, again, outlined getting back to work and ending illegitimacy as first steps to reform welfare. "Dan Quayle was right," RS said referring to the former vice-president's allusion to Murphy Brown.

The rest of the speech followed the usual track. After illegitimacy, he went into SSI (Supplemental Security Income) and funding for drug addicts. Next, RS spoke on funding for sponsored aliens, including mothers and their young children and the elderly. ~~Then followed the usual track. After illegitimacy, he went into SSI (Supplemental Security Income) and funding for drug addicts. Next, RS spoke on funding for sponsored aliens, including mothers and their young children and the elderly.~~

He concluded by summarizing his speech explaining that his was the Great Society programs of Lyndon Johnson. And that government can, in fact, do good. And that is why I believe welfare is going to be an important issue."

Before beginning the welfare presentation, RS touched on health care. He spoke of big government under Clinton's health plan as controlling the lives of the American people. He went on to place HW further left on the political spectrum, possibly trying to utilize the "Liberal" label of the 1988 Presidential election. RS said, "If we do anything close to the Clinton Plan, or anything close to what Senator Wofford would like to be seen done...I mean, Wofford is even farther to the left than Clinton. And Wofford ideally would like to see government run the whole show. He's for a single payer approach to the problem."

RS went on to sarcastically speak on HW's point of view:

to the federal government to provide health care to all their employees."

SANTORUM EVENT

Location: Somerset County, Somerset, PA, Berkebile Oil Company
Date: 4 April 1994
Time: 9:30 AM
Type of Meeting
Subject: Taxes and cutting waste
Sponsor: Owners of Berkebile Oil
Crowd Description: About 15 people, many Republicans
Media Coverage: None

His presentation touched three areas of tax reform in accordance to his plan. His plan, he claims, focuses on families, small business and deficit reduction.

He began by discussing the 1993 Budget Act, and how Clinton increased taxes and cut defense spending. He pointed out that Clinton and Wofford promised middle class tax cuts, and did not deliver. "What was promised by Bill Clinton, what was promised by Harris Wofford, in his 1991 campaign, was a middle tax cut. It was not delivered. There were no tax cuts, in fact, there were tax increases on middle income seniors."

As RS continued, he stated that the tax rates were 4 or 5% in the fifties, now it is about 27%. "There are two principle reasons for this. Number one, is the increase in S.S. tax, and S.S. tax is now up to about 8%...The biggest reason is what we have done, basically, not to support the children in our tax program. What we have done to families is continuing to not raise, or limit, the amount of deductions that families can get for their dependent deductions."

RS, speaking on the average families, and spouses being forced to work because of high taxes, RS said, "One the reasons that you see so many two parent families working is not because a lot two parent families want to work, if they want to work that's fine, but they're working, in many cases, because they have to work. They can't make ends meet without working. And so what we've got is we've taken literally 25% of their income, 20% of their income away from them after tax income-gone. And so as result, they need to supplement their income."

He went on to discuss a \$500 per child tax credit. He tried to explain the difference between his tax credit concept and regular tax deductions. "Credit is fair because it gives everybody supplement their income."

He went on to discuss a \$500 per child tax credit. He tried to explain the difference between his tax credit concept and regular tax deductions. "Credit is fair because it gives everybody the same amount, no matter how wealthy you are. You get \$500 per child, as opposed to a deductions, which could be worth more if you

Crowd Description: About 15 people, many Republicans
Media Coverage: None

His presentation touched three areas of tax reform in accordance to his plan. His plan, he claims, focuses on families, small business and deficit reduction.

He began by discussing the 1993 Budget Act, and how Clinton increased taxes and cut defense spending. He pointed out that Clinton and Wofford promised middle class tax cuts, and did not deliver. "What was promised by Bill Clinton, what was promised by Harris Wofford, in his 1991 campaign, was a middle tax cut. It was not delivered. There were no tax cuts, in fact, there were tax increases on middle income seniors."

Memo

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Date: 04/04
Re: Waffle on connection between welfare and illegitimacy.
Comment: This is not a direct hit, but contradicting implications are there. Still, it might be a stretch, unless we release it with a bunch of other quotes. Tim might have a tape with a more direct quote saying that women have children for the money, but as we know, RS is pretty slick.

Comment A:

"So what [conservative writer Charles] Murray has suggested is that we are, we are in fact encouraging behavior we don't want, that we know is in fact destructive. And so what we should do is cut off all welfare benefits to ah, to any child who, child and mother who has a child out of wedlock. Ah, that's a great theory. I'm not too sure in practice that ~~make all that well~~ ~~the government that people~~ have children be-, because they want money. And that's not obviously the motivation to why most people have children."

- Welfare Reform Meeting, Meadville, PA
Crawford County Courthouse, 03/28/94

Comment B:

"So what, what you have here is sort of a spiraling effect: you have more illegitimacy, and then you have more, more money being paid, and then you have in a sense an- ,almost a subsidy to do it. Back in the 1970s, what happened? We created these Great Society programs that paid Moms if they had children out of wedlock. Before, if you had a child out of wedlock, the government didn't help you. Now, in the late 60s, a subsidy to do it. Back in the 1970s, what happened? We created these Great Society programs that paid Moms if they had children out of wedlock. Before, if you had a child out of wedlock, the government didn't help you. Now, in the late 60s, a subsidy to do it. Back in the 1970s, what happened? We created these Great Society programs that paid Moms if they had children out of wedlock. Before, if you had a child out of wedlock, the government didn't help you. Now, in the late 60s, early 70s, we created AFDC and all these other programs to support mothers who were having children out of wedlock. So guess what happened? The poor people started having children out of wedlock, because it, it was no penalty -- there was no, there was no consequence. In fact, you got money -- if you, in fact, if, if that were the case. So these things tie together, and they feed off each other, and drive the rate up and up. We have to do something to curb this rate of illegitimacy to curb the welfare spending."

- Welfare Reform Meeting, Carlisle, PA
Masland Industries, 04/01/94

assistance; you just don't, you're not eligible.' Ah, but we're not going to encourage 16 year-olds to have children, because number one, they get something to love them, and that's always an important, ah for, an important reason why a lot of children have children. Ah, but number two, is because they get, they get a pretty big cash benefit."

- Welfare Reform Meeting, Williamsport, PA
Williamsport Wire Rope Company, 03/30/94

SANTORUM EVENT

Location: Westmoreland County, Latrobe, PA, Newcomber Products
Date: 1 April 1994
Time: 1:30 PM
Type of Meeting: Town meeting in plant
Subject: Cutting waste and taxes
Sponsor: Newcomber Products
Crowd Description: Approximately 20-25 people, all Newcomber employees
Media Coverage: None

This meeting was his regular tax/waste presentation, and he mentioned early in the presentation HW by commenting that HW doesn't get out and talk to the community.

On the issue of families, RS lashed out at HW on his tax stance, "Help the family, middle class tax cut for families... that HW promised in 1991, that Bill Clinton promised in 1992 and simply did not deliver, in fact, they delivered tax increases, not tax cuts. What I believe is that we need to focus our tax cut in the area that's really been hurting over the past few years, and that's the American family."

RS progressed, again, onto the spouse, or wife, being forced into the work force. RS stated, to the primarily male group, his opinion on spouses in the workplace and that the current administration has been "taxing families out of existence. Because, in fact, what we do is force a lot of spouses out of the house who may or may not want to be out of the house. It's like if you want to be out of the house, but in many cases they are out of the house only because we don't want you to have enough money to stay in the house." (The tape was muffled at the end, if we are going to use this quote we should check the videotape.)

He moved onto tax deductions and the Republican solution to dependent deductions; he spoke again on the \$500 credit per child.

The rest of the speech did not stray from his normal track

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall and Tim
Date: 04/13
Re: RS and race in town meetings

Comments:

"And what that means is you have a bunch of young males going out and, particularly in the inner city, going out and instead of ah being in homes with a wife and a child, they're being with gangs, causing trouble."

-- RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Williamsport Wire Rope Co.
Williamsport, PA, 03/30/94.

"In 1950, if you would have taken the dependent deduction, which I said now is 26 hundred and fifty dollars, and indexed that to inflation, from 1950 to today. 1950 -- when y'know, Ward and June and- Cleaver and ah Ozzie and Harriet were, were raising kids on one income and ah Mom was able to stay home and not forced to work."

-- RS Constituent Town Meeting
Shaler Area High School
Shaler township, near Etna, PA
03/19/94

"So what, what you have here is sort of a spiraling effect: you have more illegitimacy, and then you have more, more money being paid, and then you have in a sense an- ,almost a subsidy to do it. Back in the 1970s, what happened? We created these Great Society programs that paid Moms if they had children out of wedlock. Before, if you had a child out of wedlock, the government didn't help you. Now, in the late 60s, early 70s, we created AFDC and all these other programs to support mothers who were having children out of wedlock. So guess what happened? The poor people started having children wedlock, the government didn't help you. Now, in the late 60s, early 70s, we created AFDC and all these other programs to support mothers who were having children out of wedlock. So guess what happened? The poor people started having children out of wedlock, because it, it was no penalty -- there was no, there was no consequence. In fact, you got money..."

Comments:

"And what that means is you have a bunch of young males going out and, particularly in the inner city, going out and instead of ah being in homes with a wife and a child, they're being with gangs, causing trouble."

-- RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Williamsport Wire Rope Co.
Williamsport, PA, 03/30/94.

"In 1950, if you would have taken the dependent

"Do you know why a lot of spouses, wives have to go out and work, many want to, but a lot have to. Why? because the federal government takes more money from them."

-Washington Co.
AccuTrex
4-4-94

RS stated, to the primarily male group, his opinion on spouses in the workplace and that the current administration has been "taxing families out of existence. Because, in fact, what we do is force a lot of spouses out of the house who may or may not want to be out of the house. It's fine if you want to be out of the house, but in many cases they are out of the house only because we don't want you to have enough money to stay in the house." (The tape was muffled at the end, if we are going to use this quote we should check the videotape.)

-Westmoreland Co.
Latrobe, PA
Newcome Products
4-1-94

"One the reasons that you see so many two parent families working is not because a lot two parent families want to work, if they want to work that's fine, but they're working, because they have to work. They can't make ends meet without working. And so what we've got is we've taken literally 25% of their income, 20% of their income away from them after tax income-gone. And so as result, they need to supplement their income."

- Somerset County
Somerset, PA
Berkebile Oil Co.
4-4-94

"Dan Quayle was ostracized in the national press for mentioning Murphy Brown... But the folks having children out of wedlock are not Murphy Browns, by in large, not even by in large. It's a very small percentage. In 1950, 4% of the children born in America were born out of wedlock. Today, that mentioning Murphy Brown... African-American community, that number wedlock are not Murphy Browns, by in large, not even by in large. It's a very small percentage. In 1950, 4% of the children born in America were born out of wedlock. Today, that number is 30%.. In the African-American community, that number is 68%. 68% of the children are born to a single mom. Now, the

RS stated, to the primarily male group, his opinion on spouses in the workplace and that the current administration has been "taxing families out of existence. Because, in fact, what we do is force a lot of spouses out of the house who may or may not want to be out of the house. It's fine if you want to be out of the house, but in many cases they are out of the house only because we don't want you to have enough money to stay in the house." (The tape was muffled at the end, if we are going to use this quote we should check the videotape.)

-Westmoreland Co.
Latrobe, PA
Newcome Products

crime and all sorts of disruptions in our society, that's a reality that's occurring. You're seeing that problem all over, in particular in the inner cities where the welfare system is rampant. You have story after story about young males bragging about how many children they have sired, and having no responsibility for them."

-Centre County
State College, PA
Josten's Yearbook Publishing
3-29-94

"In the black community, it's 68% of black kids were born to single parents. In the white community, it's 22%, but still that's between one out of every four/ one out of every five children in the white community don't have a father at home, and in many cases don't even know who the father is." This statement directly contradicts his usual rhetoric. RS regularly demands that under his plan the welfare mothers must tell the government who the father is, or they will NOT receive any welfare benefits. He insists that most of these women do not tell the government the father's name because single parents receive more money and benefits through the current program.

-Snyder County
Shamokin Dam, PA
~~Susquehanna~~ Chamber of Commerce
3-30-94

-Centre County
State College, PA
Josten's Yearbook Publishing
3-29-94

"In the black community, it's 68% of black kids were born to single parents. In the white community, it's 22%, but still that's between one out of every four/ one out of every five children in the white community don't have a father at home, and in many cases don't even know who the father is." This statement directly contradicts his usual rhetoric. RS regularly demands that under his plan the welfare mothers must tell the government who the father is, or they will NOT receive any welfare benefits. He insists that most of these women do

MEMO

TO: Max, Greta, Pat
FROM: TIM
DATE: 2 July 1994
TIME: 1pm
TYPE OF MEETING: Gun rally
LOCATION: Capitol Steps, Harrisburg
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 2000 gun owners, all ultra-conservative
MEDIA COVERAGE: All local TV (chs. 8,15,27), Print media:
Bloomsburg paper only confirmed

RS began by speaking to the group about right infringements by the government on, of course the second amendment, but also, RS drew a parallel to health care.

"When I ran for the United States Senate, I mean the United States Congress, back in 1990, I had a basic theme in mind. And that is that our government should be there, should be there not to take more freedom from you, but to allow you the freedom to live the kind of life that you and your family want to live, to trust you, to trust you to solve your own problems, not to give government to control to solve problems for you. And there is probably no issue more fundamental than that than the issue of guns and gun control. What is it all about? What is it about is that the federal government, a bunch of people in Washington, and people here in Harrisburg, who want to take freedom from you because they know best. They know best in here what's best for you. Whether it's guns, or whether it's health care, they want to take more taxes from you, or choices from you and give them to Washington and Harrisburg so they can take care of you. You give up your guns, you'll be safer. You give up your money you give it to the government, we'll take care of you; we'll give you health security; we'll give you safety on your streets. Empty, hallow promises from people who have one thing in mind, control...It is fundamentally un-American."

RS continued by implying that health care rights are threatened by some of Congress' health care plans, and that it would criminal to not work with a new health care system.

RS continued by implying that health care rights are threatened by some of Congress' health care plans, and that it would criminal to not work with a new health care system.

TYPE OF MEETING: Gun rally
LOCATION: Capitol Steps, Harrisburg
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 2000 gun owners, all ultra-conservative
MEDIA COVERAGE: All local TV (chs. 8,15,27), Print media:
Bloomsburg paper only confirmed

RS began by speaking to the group about right infringements by the government on, of course the second amendment, but also, RS drew a parallel to health care.

"When I ran for the United States Senate, I mean the United States Congress, back in 1990, I had a basic theme in mind. And that is that our government should be there, should be there not to take more freedom from you, but to

crowd booed. After the mention of HW, RS begged the crowd to display bumperstickers on their cars.

"Now in the Senate race for Pennsylvania, we are going to have a pretty tough fight. We have the poster child of the Clinton Administration in Harris Wofford. He's going to have lots of money. He's going to have Bill Clinton up here probably more than he's been up here. If we're going to win this race, we're not going to win because we are going to outspend him. We're going to win because we're going to out work him because believe in the right things for this country. And the way we do that is for you to help. And I need your help. If we are going to win this race, and stand up for the Constitution and the fundamental freedoms of America, I need to do a few things. Do you see these bumper stickers out here? ... Please take a bumpersticker."

RS proceeded to speak on the 19 banned assault weapons.

"I have envelopes here, we got a little idea, surprise the folks here in the media who don't believe you guys really count, that you folks really don't make a difference. The envelope here is real simple. Take an envelope, write out a check for nineteen bucks. Well nineteen dollars, why nineteen dollars, for of nineteen semi-automatics they want to take away from you. We'll take copies of all those nineteen dollar checks, and we'll have a little press conference with stacks of these checks or them, and show them how much you do care, and how much you're willing to sacrifice for the freedom that is so essential for this country. You work with me. You stick with me, and I will stick with you."

to win this race, we're not going to win because we are going to outspend him. We're going to win because we're going to out work him because believe in the right things for this country. And the way we do that is for you to help. And I need your help. If we are going to win this race, and stand up for the Constitution and the fundamental freedoms of America, I need to do a few things. Do you see these bumper stickers out here? ... Please take a bumpersticker."

RS proceeded to speak on the 19 banned assault weapons.

"I have envelopes here, we got a little idea, surprise the folks here in the media who don't believe you guys really count, that you folks really don't make a

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 09/17/94
Re: RS @ Pullman Factory, South Philadelphia
Press: Channel 29 FOX, WHYY, Philadelphia Inquirer

Robert Wilbowe, President of Rainbow Coalition, and RS, speaking at 25th Street and Reed Street, 1 pm.

RW: Rick Santrum has been down here, we walked together two weeks ago, all African-American families and communities can endorse. He fills the needs of our neighborhoods. We need someone who to walk (?) and come down here, and see what we're living in, 24 hours a day. The building's a mess, we've got drugs, prostitution, in this area, all times of night. I'm tired of it, the community's tired of it. As Rainbow Committee leader, I'm sick and tired of Harris Wofford saying he's doing for our community, he has not done nothing. Right now he's in Harrisburg, he's up there in Carter(?) somewhere, saying he's doing a good job in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Why's he not down here walking in our community. And the health plan he has. He says that bill is written for American people? It's watered down. I'm quite sure anybody here right now can say that they have not have a decent health care yet. So it's time for us to put somebody in office that wants to help us out. Who knows health problems. Who do give us better health care. Rick Santrum is a man for [unintell] November. I'm asking all of my community leaders, my people, in Philadelphia, stand with me, and put a man in office like Rick Santrum, who cares about our community. In November, we'll be walking the streets to put him in office, in November, for US Senator, the man is here. I have a letter from Harrison Wofford that we had wrote to him numerous letters, 1992, he did not respond until May 3rd, 1994. And he write here 'Dear Mr. Wilbowe, I apologize for the delay in responding to you' well that's telling me that Harrison Wofford cares nothing about our community. He only cares about our votes when it's voting time. So it's time for us to take this trash and send it back to him; let him know that, when it comes down to Bob Wilbowe's territory, he better change. And I gotta man that's willing to make all the changes with us, here today. And Rick Santrum is the man for Harrison Wofford cares nothing about our community. He only cares about our votes when it's voting time. So it's time for us to take this trash and send it back to him; let him know that, when it comes down to Bob Wilbowe's territory, he better change. And I gotta man that's willing to make all the changes with us, here today. And Rick Santrum is the man for us in our community, and he's the man for US Senator. He sees the needs, and he care right

Re: RS @ Pullman Factory, South Philadelphia
Press: Channel 29 FOX, WHYY, Philadelphia Inquirer

Robert Wilbowe, President of Rainbow Coalition, and RS, speaking at 25th Street and Reed Street, 1 pm.

RW: Rick Santrum has been down here, we walked together two weeks ago, all African-American families and communities can endorse. He fills the needs of our neighborhoods. We need someone who to walk (?) and come down here, and see what we're living in, 24 hours a day. The building's a mess, we've got drugs, prostitution, in this area, all times of night. I'm tired of it, the community's tired of it. As Rainbow Committee leader, I'm sick

the athletic programs, they cut out the fourth grade kindergarten programs, we went in there, and work with the school administrator, and we raised the money, an organization that I headed. We went out and we got, number one we got the money, ah, to get funding for the fourth grade kindergarten program, number two, we went to out and raised the money to maintain the athletic programs, and number three we continue to set up an organization that that's an active member and to make sure that we continue to make sure that the funding is there for future programs. This is a community which has a, the majority of the streets are poor, they're minorities, and they're in a very difficult situation, when people call and ask for help, we go out there, we deliver that help, we get involved, we don't make a big press out of it, what we do is make sure that the people who need the help get the attention. I've got 67 communities in my district just like we got 67 counties in Pennsylvania. And I can tell you, in the communities that need the help, that's where we spend the time and the energy and the effort. Go talk to the city of Clairton, go talk to the city of McKeesport, go talk to the city of Duquesne, go talk to the city of Broughton(?), they're all poor communities, they've been devastated by economic strife, because of the closing of steel mills, and you ask them, who's out there fighting to help communities, you ask them, who's out there fighting to protect and improve their schools, you ask them who's fighting to maintain jobs...

memo

TO: STU
FROM: TIM
DATE: 24 Sept 1994
LOCATION: Turtle Creek, Allegheny County, Westinghouse Human Resource Center.
TYPE OF MEETING: Congressional Town Meeting?
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 30 people (mostly senior citizens) in support of RS; About 30 protesting carpenters in opposition of RS.
MEDIA COVERAGE: WTAE-TV

On his labor record,

"If you look at my voting record on union issues, it's about 85%"
"I voted with labor 85% of the time."

He continued,

"With respect to the carpenters, go check your record."
"I have a 100% voting record with you. 100% on your labor issues. I've consistently supported Davis/Bacon. I supported your apprenticeship program. I've supported striker replacement. On down the line, 100% with carpenters."

In response to a question about raising the age of retirement to around 70 within the next 30 years and how it will affect laborers, RS said,

"You're not going to work the same job all your life. You're going to change jobs, everybody does. Nowadays people work different careers because of the volatility of the economy things change so fast that you're not going to really know what you're going to go to the mill, and work at the mill the rest of your life. You're going to have to change jobs and the person who is a laborer who is working a very hard week will probably have to go on to something not as labor intensive of the economy things change so fast that you're not going to really know what you're going to go to the mill, and work at the mill the rest of your life. You're going to have to change jobs and the person who is a laborer who is working a very hard week will probably have to go on to something not as labor intensive or physically demanding, and as said before because of the changes of the demographics and the number of people who will be in the work force."

TO: STU
FROM: TIM
DATE: 24 Sept 1994
LOCATION: Turtle Creek, Allegheny County, Westinghouse Human Resource Center.
TYPE OF MEETING: Congressional Town Meeting?
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 30 people (mostly senior citizens) in support of RS; About 30 protesting carpenters in opposition of RS.
MEDIA COVERAGE: WTAE-TV

On his labor record,

"If you look at my voting record on union issues, it's about 85%"

things. Everybody in this room is probably not going to keep the same job for 50 years, or 40 years. And that's just that we have to be much more adept to the pace of change in our society is going much faster that it did 30, 40, 50 years ago. Things are more rapidly evolving. You can't stand there and say, 'well it's not fair.'

He continued,

"Well, I think there will always be struggling people. The job is to make sure that people have the ability to go out- In a free society, there will always be struggles. If you want a socialist society, where everyone is taken care of, and you don't do anything, then you won't struggle- you won't get much- but you won't struggle."

Another lie about HW and healthcare:

"My good friend, whose videotaping, Sen. Wofford, would like to see us replicate what Western Europe's- and like to give us a German-style health care reform. They'd like to have social service networks, like Germany, and Britain, and Holland and all those countries have."

What we'll do for the average working person

The question of abortion was brought up. RS responded,

"President Clinton, Senator Wofford, and others are saying is that we are going to make everyone buy abortion coverage. They're going to make a 60 year old nun pay for abortion for insurance policies. Now, that to me is offensive, that the federal government can go that far in trying to promote--

In addition, Sen. Wofford supports this also, in addition, what they require under the bill is that in all areas that don't have abortions, particularly in state like Louisiana and Utah, places like that, they are going to be required to set up a clinic. And the federal government will set them up and subsidize them."

He continued,

"Well, I think there will always be struggling people. The job is to make sure that people have the ability to go out- In a free society, there will always be struggles. If you want a socialist society, where everyone is taken care of, and you don't do anything, then you won't struggle- you won't get much- but you won't struggle."

Another lie about HW and healthcare:

"My good friend, whose videotaping, Sen. Wofford, would like to see us replicate what Western Europe's- and like to give us a German-style health care reform. They'd like to have social service networks, like Germany, and Britain, and

SANTORUM EVENT

Location: Centre County, State College, Josten's Yearbook
Publishing Plant

Date: 29 March 1994

Time: 2:30 PM

Type of Meeting: Town meeting in conference room at plant offices

Subject: Welfare Reform

Sponsor: Josten's Publishing

Crowd Description: Approximately 30-35 people, many Republicans,
all white

Media Coverage: WTAI-TV ch.10, Centre Daily Times (reporter,
photographer), WPSU 91.1 FM, 95.3 FM

-video + audio tapes of broadcasts available-

This presentation did not stray far from the normal speech, and there was very little mention of Wofford. He was introduced by an executive of Jostens's who gave only a brief biography.

When he addressed the illegitimacy rate, he again mentioned Dan Quayle. RS said, "Dan Quayle was ostracized in the national press for mentioning Murphy Brown...But the folks having children out of wedlock are not Murphy Browns, by in large, not even by in large. It's a very small percentage. In 1950, 4% of the children born in America were born out of wedlock. Today, that number is 30%..In the African-American community, that number is 68%. 68% of the children are born to a single mom. Now, the white community is 22% that's better, but we're talking about 22% of the children in the white community are born to single parents."

He also mentioned a recent David Broder article in reference to fathers on the welfare system. RS commented that in 1960, the average male was married with children. Speaking of today's 'average American male,' RS said, "What happens here is that you have fathers having children, and not taking responsibility for their children...they are out running around joining with other males causing problems that young males joining other young males cause, which is join gangs and create crime and all sorts of disruptions in our society, that's a reality that's occurring. You're seeing that problem all over, in particular in the inner cities where the welfare system is rampant. You have story after story about young males bragging about how many children they have sired, and having no responsibility for them."

The rest of the presentation followed the normal progression. cities where the welfare system is rampant. You have story after story about young males bragging about how many children they have sired, and having no responsibility for them."

The rest of the presentation followed the normal progression. cities where the welfare system is rampant. You have story after story about young males bragging about how many children they have sired, and having no responsibility for them."

The rest of the presentation followed the normal progression. He spoke about SSI applied to drug addicts and sponsored aliens.

The mention of HW was a comparison between HW and George McGovern. RS drew the connection between McGovern's ideology and Wofford's. RS said, "George McGovern ran for President against Nixon in 1972. And ran as an unabashed liberal, sort of the Harris Wofford type." X

SANTORUM EVENT

Location: Columbia County, Bloomsberg, Haleyville Drapery
Manufacturing Company

Date: 30 March 1994

Time: 3:30 PM

Type of Meeting: Mandatory employee meeting, but open to public

Subject: Welfare Reform

Sponsor: Haleyville Drapery Manufacturing Company

Crowd Description: About 80 people, all employees of Haleyville,
all white, generally an apathetic group

Media Coverage: Press-Enterprise

This presentation was very basic; he did not digress from the normal track at all. He read the general disinterest of the group and streamlined his speech. He began by introducing himself as a Congressman in a blue collar district in Pittsburgh.

He continued into his presentation by beginning with long term dependency of welfare recipients. He followed the normal progression into illegitimacy, to SSI for drug addicts, and then sponsored aliens.

The questions at the end were not significant. For example, one woman wanted to know why her neighbor, a welfare recipient, could have a nicer car than she did. The presentation was short and uneventful.

MEMO

TO: Stuart
FROM: Tim
RE: RS on WWWZ Radio, State College on
3-29-94

Comments: This was a brief report on local radio about RS's welfare presentation at Josten's Publishing in State College. Work incentives in the welfare system and illegitimacy were mentioned.

RS said "It gives people the opportunity to learn how to work and teach them the ethic. And at the same time, it provides very stiff penalties if they aren't fulfilling the social contract, which is if you don't help yourself, then we have no obligation to continue to help you."

About illegitimacy RS said,

"What we have to do is say that we going to reward responsible behavior, but we're going to punish irresponsible behavior. It's not enough to say we care about children and then let parents act irresponsibility in raising them."

SANTORUM EVENT

Location: Snyder County, Shamokin Dam, Central Susquehanna Chamber of Commerce

Date: 30 March 1994

Time: 11:30 AM

Type of Meeting: Town Meeting

Subject: Welfare Reform

Sponsor: Central Susquehanna Chamber of Commerce

Crowd Description: 7-10 people, primarily Republican

Media Coverage: Daily Adam (sp.), News Radio WQSU

He began by thanking the Chamber, and immediately labelling Wofford and old-fashioned Democrat in direct contrast with his views. RS said, [The issue of welfare]"illustrates the kind of difference between an old-fashioned Democrat like Harris Wofford and someone who believes that we need to change the system." RS went on to introduce a supporter, Representative Merle Phillips.

Without digressing any further, RS began his usual Welfare Reform presentation. He touched on long-term dependency of welfare recipients and then continued to illegitimacy where he again referred to Dan Quayle's Murphy Brown statement. He said, "Dan Quayle hit the nail on the head."

RS spoke, as usual, on the racial differences of illegitimate births, "In the black community, it's 68% of black kids were born to single parents. In the white community, it's 22%, but still that's between one out of every five and one out of every three children in the white community don't have a father at home, and in many cases don't even know who the father is." This statement directly contradicts his usual rhetoric. RS regularly demands that under his plan the welfare mothers must tell the government who the father is, or they will NOT receive any welfare benefits. He insists that most of these women do not tell the government the father's name because single parents receive more money and benefits through the current program.

As RS continues into SSI funding for drug addicts, he mentions Wofford as someone who wants to spend more on welfare. "The problem is the Bill Clintons and, I'm sure the Harris Woffords, of this world will tell you that we don't spend enough money on welfare. The problem is the system doesn't work. It has too many disincentives for responsible behavior and too many incentives for irresponsible behavior." ~~is the Bill Clintons and, I'm sure the Harris Woffords, of this world will tell you that we don't spend enough money on welfare. The problem is the system doesn't work. It has too many disincentives for responsible behavior and too many incentives for irresponsible behavior."~~ ~~is the Bill Clintons and, I'm sure the Harris Woffords, of this world will tell you that we don't spend enough money on welfare. The problem is the system doesn't work. It has too many disincentives for responsible behavior and too many incentives for irresponsible behavior."~~

The normal speech track was followed through to the end of the speech with no digressions. RS did, however, mention HW a few times in while answering questions. The first question dealt with pharmaceutical companies and immunization. RS said, "With immunization, Mrs. Clinton, Senator Wofford loves to do this- and you do Harris [pointing to the camera]- he loves to bang the pharmaceutical companies because they are terrible people who rip off the public, never the less they employ 14,000 people in Pennsylvania, never the less take all the private sector money, venture capital money to invest in new drugs is drying up because they are afraid to invest in pharmaceutical that are going to be rejected by the Federal Health programs that will not be

economically efficient or whatever the case may be."

RS mentioned HW again when a question was raised about strike replacement ~~litigation~~. RS voted for striker replacement, and HW voted against the bill. RS declared that the bill was "too much slanted toward labor." Incidentally, a similar question was raised by a union member in Williamsport earlier this day.

Wofford was mentioned finally in response to a question on product liability reform. RS responded, "I'm exactly on the opposite side of him [on product reform]...He was one of eight or nine Senators who voted against the airline [liability bill] ...I mean who does he represent? ...He just votes 100% down the line for more litigation, for more regulation. It's unfortunate because one of the principle problems I see in this country is a legal system that is not sensitive to the competitiveness that we have to deal with around the world. It puts at a big disadvantage...And, of course, the consumer pays in the end, and the people who lose their jobs because they can no longer pay afford to employ people, and no longer afford to be competitive. The people who win are the folks that give Harris Wofford 20% of all the money you raise and that is trial lawyers."

In an answer to another question RS took another shot at HW, "Harris Wofford believes we should take away your guns, but we shouldn't do anything about requiring tougher sentences. He believes in quick fix answers instead of something that's tough like when people are repeat offenders you put them in jail and throw away the key after a while."

product liability reform. RS responded, "I'm exactly on the opposite side of him [on product reform]...He was one of eight or nine Senators who voted against the airline [liability bill] ...I mean who does he represent? ...He just votes 100% down the line for more litigation, for more regulation. It's unfortunate because one of the principle problems I see in this country is a legal system that is not sensitive to the competitiveness that we have to deal with around the world. It puts at a big disadvantage...And, of course, the consumer pays in the end, and the people who lose their jobs because they can no longer pay afford to employ people, and no longer afford to be competitive. The people who win are the folks that give Harris Wofford 20% of all the money you raise and that is trial lawyers."

In an answer to another question RS took another shot at HW,

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 10/19/94
Re: W/ Arlen Specter, Rep. Molinari, @ St Joe's College
Media: Philadelphia Inquirer, AP

Comments:

The subject of this discussion was crime on campus, which was discussed almost exclusively by Rep. Molinari. RS was late and AS left early, so they missed each other. Only 25 students attended, seemingly all Republicans. RS spoke briefly on how wonderful both Rep. Molinari and St Joe's College were on the issue of crime and violence on campus, and then responded briefly to a question on health care (medical savings, bringing down premiums by raising deductibles), at greater length on crime, and then answered a question about welfare reform.

On Health Care:

RS: When it comes to routine care, that should be paid for out of pocket. You should only pay the insurance company for covering things that are unexpected, sort of, you know, catastrophic kinds of things. So we came up with the idea of a medical savings account.

On Crime:

RS goes through standard death penalty, limiting appeals, good faith exception, liberal judges spots. New was another case Judge Barkett ruled on, and a response to a question about plea bargains.

On Barkett:

RS: This was a case in Florida also, where there was an individual who was African American who formed a group with three other people called the Black Liberation Army who went out and decided that white people are the problem and went out on a spree of shooting white people because they are white. One of the victims that (?) shot, there were (?) people, was a guy named Orlando, and what he did was, after the shooting incident, he audio taped in detail the murder. And went through the shooting.

Comments:

The subject of this discussion was crime on campus, which was discussed almost exclusively by Rep. Molinari. RS was late and AS left early, so they missed each other. Only 25 students attended, seemingly all Republicans. RS spoke briefly on how wonderful both Rep. Molinari and St Joe's College were on the issue of crime and violence on campus, and then responded briefly to a question on health care (medical savings, bringing down premiums by raising deductibles), at greater length on crime, and then answered a question about welfare reform.

On Health Care:

be put to death [?] Now, Harris Wofford voted to put this judge on the second highest court in the nation. Now, that is an irresponsible vote. Sen. Specter voted against Judge Barkett. It was a horrendous vote. If you're going to put people like that on the bench, don't run around talking about how to be tough on crime, because you're gonna let people who are very bad people back out into our society.

*didn't vote
for equitable*

RS talks about Victims' Rights Act of 1994: habeas corpus reform and exclusion rule, mandate prison work, prohibits TVs, radios, cable TV.

On Plea Bargaining:

RS: Plea bargaining is a result of just some of the things that we talked about. I mean you've got over crowding of prisons and ah, you have to, in some cases you plea bargain because this guy isn't as bad as some other guy, that they, you know, that they don't have room for in jail. So they, in some cases plea bargaining is used as an effective tool to try to get, you know, plea bargain the guy who stood by and watched the murder to make sure we got the murderer. So it's not always a, ah, it's not always used to let people off, sometimes it is used as a bargaining chip very effectively against the person who really is(?) the bad guy.

*didn't vote
for equitable*

RS talks about Victims' Rights Act of 1994: habeas corpus reform and exclusion rule, mandate prison work, prohibits TVs, radios, cable TV.

On Plea Bargaining:

RS: Plea bargaining is a result of just some of the things that we talked about. I mean you've got over crowding of prisons and ah, you have to, in some cases you plea bargain because this guy isn't as bad as some other guy, that they, you know, that they don't have room for in jail. So they, in some cases plea bargaining is used as an effective tool to try to get, you know,

2nd Meeting

Location: Shaler Area High School, in the northern Greater Pittsburgh area.
Date, time: 03/19/94, 1:30 PM.
Type: Constituent town meeting.
Subject: Multi-issue, focusing on health care reform.
Sponsor: None.
Crowd: 60-70 people, many Senior Citizens, most strong RS supporters.
Media: Camerawoman, unsure which TV station
Reporter, North Hills News Record (clip attached)

Comments: As at the 1st meeting, RS began with a quick 5 minute presentation. He first discussed his own initiatives, describing himself as the Republican chosen by leadership to draft the GOP's welfare reform proposal without any specifics. He also mentioned his health care plan, but again no details. Instead, he told the audience: "I've been going around the state having town meetings... talking about the alternatives to what the President is suggesting... and getting the media to report what the President has to meet to have real reform of the welfare system..."

RS then provided a quick synopsis of 'what's happening in Washington', commencing with the status of the Clinton health care reform package. Again, he gloated over the fact that the Health subcommittee was not considering the Clinton plan. As at the first meeting, he dismissed Stark's plan as a "backdoor single-payer". Second, he decried the failure of the Balanced Budget Amendment, pointing out that it lost by more votes this year than last time because of the President's opposition. Finally, he described the President's 1994 budget as a continuation of the '93 Clinton plan. As at the first meeting, he described the alternative Kasich Republican budget, again going into deep detail concerning the \$500/child family credit. During this speech, he issued one statement which merited

Type: Constituent town meeting.
Subject: Multi-issue, focusing on health care reform.
Sponsor: None.
Crowd: 60-70 people, many Senior Citizens, most strong RS supporters.
Media: Camerawoman, unsure which TV station
Reporter, North Hills News Record (clip attached)

Comments: As at the 1st meeting, RS began with a quick 5 minute presentation. He first discussed his own initiatives, describing himself as the Republican chosen by leadership to draft

"Why don't we have insurance for food? Food is a right; everybody accepts that we have a right to food. We have, you know, it's an important thing; we need it to live on. Why don't we have food insurance? The answer: because we don't have catastrophic food bills. See, the reason health insurance was created in the first place is the reason any insurance is around: to protect against bankruptcy, to protect against being, y'know, unable to pay a major bill. But when it comes to routine care, when it comes to the ordinary care that we consume as a society, as an individual, why do we have insurance companies paying for routine visits, things that we can budget for, things that we should be able to pay for out of our own pocket? The answer is they shouldn't. That insurance is to insure against risk, not about certainty. Nobody has zero deductible auto insurance. You'd pay a fortune for that, and you'd probably never turn in a claim, because your insurance would go up even more. Well, what do you think happens in this system? You turn in all these health care claims and the insurance goes up. There was a report filed the other day that said 55 percent of all emergency room visits are non-emergencies. Who are those 55 percent? Are any of them fee-for-service patients? Are any of them patients who come in and have to pay for the insurance for the emergency room? Almost none. Who are these patients? Most of them were Medicaid. Most of them were free. So they've used the emergency room as their place to get, to get primary care, because it's free. It's a very expensive place to get free care. It's the wrong place to get care. But see, you don't pay for it, so you don't worry about what the cost is. Somehow or another you have to get back in the system. If you don't, you will be told what health care you can get. Period."

"Well, we're going to change that system. We're going to bring you back into the system when it comes to routine health care."

"Well, we're going to change that system. We're going to bring you back into the system when it comes to routine health care."

"If you don't spend 3000 dollars over the course of the year, you keep the money. See it's a 'spend-it-or-keep-it' account. So now against bankruptcy, to protect against being, y'know, unable to pay a major bill. But when it comes to routine care, when it comes to the ordinary care that we consume as a society, as an individual, why do we have insurance companies paying for routine visits, things that we can budget for, things that we should be able to pay for out of our own pocket? The answer is they shouldn't. That insurance is to insure against risk, not about certainty. Nobody has zero deductible auto insurance. You'd pay a fortune for that, and you'd probably never turn in a claim, because your insurance would go up even more. Well, what do you think happens in this system? You turn in all these health care claims and the insurance goes up. There was a

He then answered questions. A large number of the questions centered on the health care debate. Attached is a pretty comprehensive set of health care quotes. I will merely touch on the highlights in this memo.

Health Care: As in the previous meeting, he showed his Medisave chart, but this time left out the Dole chart of the Clinton plan. Although the first question was about his plan, he began the health care discussion with an attack on the Clinton plan, laying out the usual fear-inducing charges: will ration care, will drastically limit doctor choice, will not curtail costs. In typical Tricky style, he tailored the charges for his aged audience, claiming the Clinton plan would hurt Senior Citizens because they would be the first to experience rationing as "the least economic person to buy care for". This could be a hit for us, as the Clinton plan benefits Seniors more than Medisave.

He then used his favorite trope, comparing the health care problems of the 1990s to the hunger problems of the 1960s. It is a catchy little comparison for him, rendering his piecemeal health care reform understandable and likeable. But the comparison opens him up to a nice hit from us. I see an ad where he compares the health care problem to the food problem and champions food stamps, followed by our list of the numerous times RS voted against food stamps.

When he got to specifics of his program, he stepped up his folksy rhetoric, calling his Medisave plan "a spend-it-or-keep-it account". He appeals to self-interest and a sense of responsibility. He points out the virtues of capitalist consumption, predicting that we can curb costs and provide families with extra money. Whether or not his numbers ring true, its a well delivered message -- appealing in combining self-interest and self-sacrifice.

He next attacked the numbers, breaking the uninsured down into temporarily uninsured and more permanently uninsured ~~appealing in combining self-interest and self-sacrifice.~~

He next attacked the numbers, breaking the uninsured down into temporarily uninsured and more permanently uninsured figures. He claimed that 1/2 are in the temporary category, 4 months or less, 1/4 are in the middle, 4 mos. to 1 year. Of the plan. Although the first question was about his plan, he began the health care discussion with an attack on the Clinton plan, laying out the usual fear-inducing charges: will ration care, will drastically limit doctor choice, will not curtail costs. In typical Tricky style, he tailored the charges for his aged audience, claiming the Clinton plan would hurt Senior Citizens because they would be the first to experience rationing as "the least economic person to buy care for". This could be a hit for us, as the Clinton plan benefits Seniors more than Medisave.

He then used his favorite trope, comparing the health care problems of the 1990s to the hunger problems of the 1960s. It is a

For the more permanently uninsured, the government will provide subsidies through tax credits to continue to buy insurance and/or invest in the Medisave account between jobs.

RS then attacked the Clinton plan's claim of universal coverage, asserting that Hillary Clinton herself admitted that the plan would leave 4% uninsured. He then questioned this prediction, pointing to Hawaii's uninsurance rate which he claims fluctuates between 8 and 11 percent. He took this point to an extreme, questioning whether in PA, where the uninsured rate is 8.4%, the Clinton plan will decrease or increase the number of people covered.

Finally, he attacked the Clinton plan as financially and economically unsound. He claimed the payroll tax will not come close to covering the cost of the plan, thus creating another runaway entitlement program. In addition, it will cost the country a large number of jobs; he claims between 1 and 3 million. This will hit Pittsburgh, a health-care intensive area, hard.

Throughout the health care session, he characterized Wofford as a "way out liberal", a strong believer in big government, an egghead who believes he knows best for everyone. Meanwhile, he tries to appear a folksy, common man standing up for traditional American values of personal responsibility, freedom, and capitalism. He perhaps takes this commitment to capitalism a little far in waxing poetic about the pharmaceutical industry, but he drew his biggest round of applause with the following emotional quote: "... you have the decision, not somebody else. That's what America's all about. It's about you keeping freedom; it's about you having choices, not paying folks who think they know better than you do to take care of you." Worth noting is that he continually couches the health care problem in different terms depending on the situation, saying both "We need to make drastic changes" and "What we have is a good system that needs to be repaired, not a system that is fundamentally flawed." He flirted with contradicting himself in the space of this one meeting.

Other issues addressed:

Deficit Reduction: Attacked the President for not continuing to cut the deficit, calling Clinton and the Dems. "a bunch of guys who believe the government is the answer to everything and wanna spend more money..." His examples are national service, welfare bill. Also endorsed pushing back social security retirement age to 70 and beyond.

Welfare Reform: Calls the President's draft "a joke", which would spend \$14 to expand welfare services for every \$1 to put people to work. He then dismisses the theory that one cannot live on

minimum wage or that welfare pays better than a low-wage job, claiming that with the Earned Income Tax Credit, food stamps, day care tax credit, and a possible housing voucher, one can earn the equivalent of \$14-15000, maybe more. "Work already pays," he said, "People should have to contribute something to help take care of their families." He pointed out that the govt. already does a lot to help families, and under his bill would do more. According to RS, the only valid problem with getting off welfare and into the job force is the risk of losing insurance. But, he claimed, no matter what health care reform package the Congress passes, this problem will be addressed through health care subsidies of some kind. This opens him for an easy hit if we can show that his health care reform package does not address the problem.

He concludes by citing statistics to back up his theory that we need to push people off the welfare rolls. He points out that 80% of American families with no full-time employees are below the poverty line compared with 6% of families with one full-time employee. He maintains that there are jobs out there, but the welfare system has created a culture of poverty. RS's solutions are 1) to track down deadbeat Dads by requiring single mothers to report the name of the father, 2) to give the poor a chance, by snoving them off the welfare system into a job, saying "we're snoving them into an opportunity."

National Service Plan: Explained his vote against National Service by claiming that it would not increase the amount of money available to would-be college students. All it would do was encourage graduates to repay loans through make-work, bureaucratic jobs rather than by making money in the private sector. He also attacked the plan as an insult to veterans/members of the military that one year of National Service can qualify a student for the equivalent of 90% of the benefits of a G.I. bill. "But it is typical of Clinton and the chief sponsor in the House (his mistake), Mr. Wofford, because they believe that government is the ones that do the equivalent of 90% of the benefits of a G.I. bill. "But it is typical of Clinton and the chief sponsor in the House (his mistake), Mr. Wofford, because they believe that government is the ones that do good here... We don't like veterans, we like government."

Overview: RS was preaching to the converted at this meeting, neip families, and under his bill would do more. According to RS, the only valid problem with getting off welfare and into the job force is the risk of losing insurance. But, he claimed, no matter what health care reform package the Congress passes, this problem will be addressed through health care subsidies of some kind. This opens him for an easy hit if we can show that his health care reform package does not address the problem.

He concludes by citing statistics to back up his theory that we need to push people off the welfare rolls. He points out that 80% of American families with no full-time employees are below the poverty line compared with 6% of families with one full-time

RS Health Care Quotes -- 03/19, Shaler

"The object behind the Medical Savings Account idea is a, is a pretty simple one. Number one, someone's going to have to start controlling costs in our system, because we're not going to allow everyone to get all the health care they want for as long as they want. The fallacy of the Clinton/Wofford plan is: you're going to get a card and you can just get all the health care you want, and it's going to be free and everyone will get as much as you want. Y'know, the Soviet Union promised that, Britain promises that, all these -- Canada promises that, and it simply isn't true. Because you begin rationing care, there isn't enough. I mean there just isn't simply -- Y'know P.J. O'Rourke says, "If you think health care's expensive now just wait 'till it's free." You just, there just simply isn't enough money for everyone to, to use the system, and to overuse the system, because you get this free card. And what they end up doing -- every system in the world that does this rationing care. They limit the amount of technology available, ah they limit the surgery, particularly on the Seniors. You wanna, you wanna talk -- the seniors' lobby in Washington, I have to scratch my head sometimes. I mean, they're for these universal kind of systems and they're the ones that are going to be rationed, 'cuz you're the ones as Mrs. Clinton says 'We can't go out -- and we have to make prudent decisions on an economic basis as to whether people should get care or not.' Now who do you think, who do you think suffers economically, ah who do you think is the least economic ah person to go buy care for? Well, the people who are old have the shortest amount of time with the procedure. Ah so those're, those are the kind of rough decisions that will be made if you don't do something about it. When I say you, the government's either gonna ration your care, and that's what Clinton and Wofford want because they think they know better, they, they obviously think that they know better how to, how to run the health care system or you're gonna have to take more responsibility for your health care and start to make want. The fallacy of the Clinton/Wofford plan is: you're going to get a card and you can just get all the health care you want, and it's going to be free and everyone will get as much as you want. Y'know, the Soviet Union promised that, Britain promises that, all these -- Canada promises that, and it simply isn't true. Because you begin rationing care, there isn't enough. I mean there just isn't simply -- Y'know P.J. O'Rourke says, "If you think health care's expensive now just wait 'till it's free." You just, there just simply isn't enough money for everyone to, to use the system, and to overuse the system, because you get this free card. And what they end up doing -- every system in the world that does this rationing care. They limit the

"I can tell you one thing. I am not going to make a decision if you're not going to get health care because it's going to be too expensive for us to give you that procedure. Not me, and I won't have it happen as long as I'm around, because the first person who loses is senior citizens. And it isn't going to happen with me on the watch. Period."

"Number two, let's talk about the person who doesn't have insurance, because that's a question that I think this young lady wants to ask. So let me, let me, let me focus on that. Because there are thousands of people out there, millions of people out there who don't have insurance. And how will they get treated under this? Well, let's talk about the uninsured, because there's a lot of fallacies out there about who the uninsured are. First off, over half the uninsured are not long-term uninsured; half the uninsured are uninsured for four months or less. They are temporarily uninsured. There are actually, if you consider that, the 37 million people, there are actually, if you look at it, about 2/3 of, about 25 million are not actually 25 million people. There are about 60 million people who turn over, very quickly, who make up the equivalent of 28 million full-time people being uninsured. That's a point that you have to remember. There aren't 37 million people in this country who are always uninsured. It just isn't the case. There constantly are people in between jobs, entering the job market, moving, whatever the case may be, had their insurance canceled. So that's a very different problem than a long-term, chronically low-paid, uninsured worker."

"For the temporary uninsured, the biggest problem with them is having their insurance dropped or, or, or not being able to take it from job to job, or losing their insurance because of an illness, or not being able to get insurance because of a pre-existing condition. Number 1, we eliminate pre-existing condition clauses, so insurance companies cannot exclude someone who has insurance to go and get

"Number two, let's talk about the person who doesn't have insurance, because that's a question that I think this young lady wants to ask. So let me, let me, let me focus on that. Because there are thousands of people out there, millions of people out there who don't have insurance. And how will they get treated under this? Well, let's talk about the uninsured, because there's a lot of fallacies out there about who the uninsured are. First off, over half the uninsured are not long-term uninsured; half the uninsured are uninsured for four months or less. They are temporarily uninsured. There are actually, if you consider that, the 37 million people, there

insurance. Now in both those situations, if you are someone with catastrophic illnesses, you are gonna have ... you will have to pay more. Frankly that makes sense; people who use the insurance system, who use the health care system more, should pay a little more than the people who don't. I don't have a problem with that, as long as it's reasonable and affordable. What we do is say that the maximum amount that you have to pay more is 50 percent more than the average policy; maximum amount is 50 percent more. Anything above fifty percent more of what the cost should be is borne by the government in a special pool. So the government subsidizes the catastrophic person, the person who has cancer or some debilitating illness; we subsidize those premiums and keep them in the insurance premium pool, the private sector pool, so that the, the risk is spread across and the government subsidizes those people. They pay more, but frankly they should pay a little bit more because they're using the system more. And that's fair as far as I'm concerned."

"Finally, and this is where Medical Savings Accounts comes in, is the person who's uninsured for a short period of time: sometimes they're unemployed and looking and looking and looking for a new job, they, they maybe lose their insurance. In our case, you have a Medical Savings Account. You have money in that account that you can use tax-free to buy or continue to buy your insurance. Because under COPA?, your employer has to provide that insurance that you had for 18 months after you leave your employment. Now you have a savings account available for you to continue to purchase insurance during periods of uninsurance, during periods of unemployment. So we provide the safety net there. And even if you didn't have the Medical Savings Account, if you are in the situation where you're collecting unemployment, we would provide to you a tax credit to give you additional funds to be able to go out, just for health insurance, like a voucher, to go out and to purchase, ah to continue to purchase your, your health care coverage when you're unemployed maximum amount that you have to pay more is 50 percent more than the average policy; maximum amount is 50 percent more. Anything above fifty percent more of what the cost should be is borne by the government in a special pool. So the government subsidizes the catastrophic person, the person who has cancer or some debilitating illness; we subsidize those premiums and keep them in the insurance premium pool, the private sector pool, so that the, the risk is spread across and the government subsidizes those people. They pay more, but frankly they should pay a little bit more because they're using the system more. And that's fair as far as I'm concerned."

and then you have the rest, who are long-term. A big chunk of the long-term will never be insured, because they don't wanna be insured. Give ya one, give ya one example -- there'll be 1 percent of uninsured in Pennsylvania no matter what we do. They're Amish; you're not gonna insure the Amish. They don't wanna be insured. Can't make them be insured. And there are a lot of people in this country who simply refuse to get insurance and will do everything they can, they don't believe in it. And so, you have to remember we are a very diverse country. And, and to suggest that everyone's gonna be covered is a fallacy.

"Mrs. Clinton, when I asked her this question: 'How many people will still be uninsured under your plan?' All of you believe it's 0, right? Wrong. She said 4 percent. After her plan is fully implemented. She said Hawaii has a 4 percent uninsured rate, we'll have a 4 percent because Hawaii's had an employer-mandated system for twenty years. But guess what? Hawaii's uninsured rate isn't 4 percent anymore. It was for a long time. Until what? Until health care costs started to go out of control. Do you know what it is now? Anywhere, it fluctuates anywhere between 8 and 11 percent. Do you know what Pennsylvania's uninsured rate is? 8.4 percent. You see, this is a fallacy. What your, what, what Hawaii does, what Clinton does, what Wofford does, is force you into a big system run by the government where you get told what health care you get. Well see, employers and, and employees, if they don't want it, they'll find a way to get around having to pay for it, and that's why you have high uninsured rates in Hawaii. What we need to do is encourage people to get the health care they want, to buy the insurance they want. Give them incentives, give them the wherewithal. You will cover more people giving the carrot approach, as opposed to the mandate or giving the stick approach to ah, to be in a system that they may not want to be in.

"Finally, getting, getting to the point of how do we cover the uninsured, ah the, the folks who are low-income. We do it the same a system that they may not want to be in.

"Finally, getting, getting to the point of how do we cover the uninsured, ah the, the folks who are low-income. We do it the same way we did it with food. Back in the 1960s, we decided everybody country who simply refuse to get insurance and will do everything they can, they don't believe in it. And so, you have to remember we are a very diverse country. And, and to suggest that everyone's gonna be covered is a fallacy.

"Mrs. Clinton, when I asked her this question: 'How many people will still be uninsured under your plan?' All of you believe it's 0, right? Wrong. She said 4 percent. After her plan is fully implemented. She said Hawaii has a 4 percent uninsured rate, we'll have a 4 percent because Hawaii's had an employer-mandated system for twenty years. But guess what? Hawaii's uninsured rate isn't 4 percent anymore. It was for a long time. Until what? Until

have the best health care and the best doctors, we have the best ah medical technology, we export our technology and our health care all over the world. People come to this country to get our health care. Why, why throw that system out because some people can't get insurance? Let's get them into the system, give them the equivalent of food stamps -- health stamps, vouchers, tax credits, tax exclusion if you're, if you're high enough income, so you can get into the system and participate either in a Medical Savings Account or an HMO or whatever else you want to participate in."

"Because those who have read the plan -- I mean, this is the standard line you will get from the Clinton folks is that there are choices out there. Let me tell you what your choices are. Your choice, you must be in a health alliance, you must. Unless you work for an employer of 500, of over 5000 people, you must be in a health alliance. Who runs the health alliance? Well, it's determined by the Governor and the State Legislature -- the equivalent of the Turnpike Commission will run the health alliance in the Pittsburgh area. That's who will be contracting with insurance companies to provide your health services. And what insurance companies will be provided, there'll be a premium cap, set by the Federal Government, set by the National Health Care Board, as to how much money the Pittsburgh alliance can charge in premium costs. What will that do? Everyone who understands the health care decisions in this country will tell you that that basically means the vast majority, if not exclusively, will be managed care, because fee-for-services plans will simply be above the caps. They're too expensive. So, everyone will be in managed care. Your choice will be which, which HMO do you want to belong to, run by which insurance company. You won't be able to choose your doctor, you'll be able to choose a doctor. You'll be able to pick what plan you want, and if a doctor belongs to that plan that you want, fine. If your pediatrician belongs to that plan, great. If your obstetrician belongs to another plan, you're out of luck. If you pick what plan you want, and if a doctor belongs to that plan that you want, fine. If your pediatrician belongs to that plan, great. If your obstetrician belongs to another plan, you're out of luck. If you're lucky enough that all your doctors belong to one plan, great. if you're, if you're high enough income, so you can get into the system and participate either in a Medical Savings Account or an HMO or whatever else you want to participate in."

"Because those who have read the plan -- I mean, this is the standard line you will get from the Clinton folks is that there are choices out there. Let me tell you what your choices are. Your choice, you must be in a health alliance, you must. Unless you work for an employer of 500, of over 5000 people, you must be in a health alliance. Who runs the health alliance? Well, it's determined by the Governor and the State Legislature -- the equivalent of the Turnpike

government projection of every government plan is (unintell.) when it comes to what the cost is."

"... the tax doesn't cover what the cost is, and it won't cover what the cost is. And employer after employer have come to me and run those same numbers. 7.9 percent doesn't cover what they say it will cover. It just doesn't do it. And the fact of the matter is that it's low because there're still restrictions on what you can get. When you get this card, you're, everything that is covered under that card, just walk in, it's all yours. No co-payments, you just get it. Y'know, I'll tell you what, people will get it, people will use it. You look at every other country and what happens? They ration care, and anyone who believes, who's looking through rose-colored glasses enough to believe that the federal government will not ration care based on, on, on, on a system where you get this little card, doesn't know anything about this debate, hasn't looked at every other country in the world who has done exactly what the Clintons are planning.

"Why do you think everyone is moving away from this? The fact of the matter is every Congressman who, why do you think that the Congress has not brought up the Clinton bill? Because everybody who's looked at this sees the same thing. This isn't me talking, this is Democrats, Republicans. Not the way out worried liberals, but y'know the, the moderate Democrats on to the right recognize what government systems are... Canada rations, Britain rations care, France rations care, Belgium rations. They all do. It's, it is inevitable that the government will make decisions about what health care you get. Now, she (questioner), says well we ration care now. Y'know how we ration care now, and you're absolutely right, we don't give people access to insurance, and therefore and that's wrong. Well, we gotta change that, we've gotta give people an opportunity to go out and get their insurance. But once they get their insurance, I don't mind rationing care based on your willingness to pay for it. We ration food ~~in this country based on whether you want to pay for it or not, but~~ their insurance. But once they get their insurance, I don't mind rationing care based on your willingness to pay for it. We ration food ~~in this country based on whether you want to pay for it or not, but~~ their insurance. But once they get their insurance, I don't mind rationing care based on your willingness to pay for it. We ration food in this country based on whether you want to pay for it or not, but you have the decision, not somebody else. That's what America's all about. It's about you keeping freedom; it's about you keeping responsibility, about you having choices, not paying folks who think they know better than you do to take care of you." (applause)

"What we have is a good system that needs to be repaired, not a system that is fundamentally flawed."

On pharmaceutical companies and their profits:

"This is, this is the idea that government somehow is the best to do everything, and it just absolutely burns my butt to see, to see the United States of America turning into a country that, that just penalizes success, that, that you know, that props up an education system that doesn't provide education, and penalizes pharmaceutical companies who cure diseases day after day after day. You tell me how that makes sense, and I'll tell you why the country we live in right now is in big trouble."

Uses veterans as an example of the poor administration of the Federal Government, describing the cuts in funding of Veteran Hospitals, the cuts in coverage, etc.:

"If we can do that to the veterans of this country, and we do. If we can treat our veterans this way, given of what they've given to our country, given the power of their lobby in Washington, imagine what we will do to you. Imagine what we will do to you."

"If you're in Canada, you love the system as long as you're healthy, 'cuz you can get all the primary care you want. But if you have something wrong with you, you can't get care. That's free, you see, it's free. You got the card that can never be taken away from you. What they don't tell you is there may not be any place for you to use that card."

"I'm not standing here, and I wanna stress this over and over, I'm not standing here saying we don't need to do something. We need to make some dramatic changes. We need to reform the malpractice laws; no-one talks about this. Certainly Clinton doesn't, certainly Wofford doesn't. He doesn't want to talk about reforming the malpractice laws. Why? Because guess who finances their campaigns? Lawyers. 25 percent of Harris Wofford's ah, you know campaign contributions come from lawyers, Bill Clinton's financed by lawyers. And so they don't, they're not for malpractice reform." campaigns? Lawyers. 25 percent of Harris Wofford's ah, you know campaign contributions come from lawyers, Bill Clinton's financed by lawyers. And so they don't, they're not for malpractice reform."

how that makes sense, and I'll tell you why the country we live in right now is in big trouble."

Uses veterans as an example of the poor administration of the Federal Government, describing the cuts in funding of Veteran Hospitals, the cuts in coverage, etc.:

"If we can do that to the veterans of this country, and we do. If we can treat our veterans this way, given of what they've given to our country, given the power of their lobby in Washington, imagine what we will do to you. Imagine what we will do to you."

“... a lot of low-income people don’t have access to health care when they leave, ah when they leave ah welfare and into a low-wage job that doesn’t provide insurance. And we have to do something about that. Once we get that problem solved, which I think we will no matter what approach we take, there will be low-income subsidies for people who, who need the, the health insurance who are trying to transition off welfare. I mean, but the excuse that you’re better off on welfare than you are out working is simply not true.”

RS Health Care Quotes - 03/19, Seton LaSalle

“The Ways and, ... The Health Subcommittee of the Ways and Means is not considering the Clinton bill. That’s not the bill that they’re marking up. They’re marking up a ... ah... The Chairman has come up with his own idea of health care reform; it’s called Medicare Part C, a new Medicare program which would just cover the uninsured. Many people believe that that’s a program that is really just a backdoor single payer, because if you create a government program and all the uninsured are in it, and people with the general package (of zero?), well what’s the incentive for businesses to continue to provide private insurance? Just cancel the insurance and all your employees will go on the government program. You don’t have to pay any extra money. Ah so what we believe is that this is a program that is basically just a, really is single payer.”

are trying to transition off welfare. I mean, but the excuse that you’re better off on welfare than you are out working is simply not true.”

RS Health Care Quotes - 03/19, Seton LaSalle

“The Ways and, ... The Health Subcommittee of the Ways and Means is not considering the Clinton bill. That’s not the bill that they’re marking up. They’re marking up a ... ah... The Chairman has come up with his own idea of health care reform; it’s called Medicare Part C, a new Medicare program which would just cover the

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 08/1/94
Re: RS Press Conference on Fugitive Felons

Location: Harrisburg Rotunda, 10 AM
Attendance: 20 RS supporters
Media: Pete Shelley, The Patriot et al
Comments:

RS introduced himself as the chairman of the Republican task force on Welfare Reform, and described the thrust of today's conference - a bill introduced in the last few weeks ago, with bipartisan support, to track down "fugitive felons" who receive welfare benefits. The bill's initiatives are twofold: 1) to cut off welfare benefits to convicted felons on the lamb and 2) to allow law enforcement officials to receive information regarding fugitives from welfare offices without first obtaining a court order.

RS: It is very important that we have a campaign that focuses on issues that are important to the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this country. And what I am going to be doing, have been doing, for this campaign is press conferences, town meetings to talk about important issues that face this country. One the issues that I'm heavily involved in Washington is welfare reform. I'm the chairman of the Republican taskforce on welfare reform in Congress. I wrote, along with Tom DeLay, the co-chair, I wrote the Republican welfare bill that has a hundred and sixty-five Republican sponsors, which, in many respects, was copied by the mainstream forum.

He continued,

So welfare, to me, is as an important issue as we will face this year, and if not this year, certainly in the next session of Congress, and I want to be leader in that, have been in the House, and want to continue to do so in the Senate.

face this year, and if not this year, certainly in the next session of Congress, and I want to be leader in that, have been in the House, and want to continue to do so in the Senate.

next session of Congress, and I want to be leader in that, have been in the House, and want to continue to do so in the Senate.

There's one issue that has come up recently, in fact, that I think deserves special attention and may, in fact- we're trying an expedited consideration of in the House of Representatives. And that's issue that was brought to my attention by some people in Pittsburgh and some folks, who I believe, did a study up in Cleveland. Fugitive felons, people who convicted, or indicted, or imprisoned [unintel.], or on parole. Fugitives who are convicted felon, indicted on felonies who are on the lamb, avoiding the law, receiving

welfare benefits. Believe it or not, recent studies show that one third of all fugitive felons arrested have welfare cards...and in most cases receive it in their right name, not an assumed name.

We just found a report in the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review of a small town in Florida where a fugitive named James Bradley who was arrested after being a runaway for ten years for murder...(from end of last month)

Welfare offices have refused to give these names and addresses of fugitive felons to police...Someone sued them for having been caught using that method, and the judge said it was invasion of his privacy.

With RS, was the legal counsel to the Fraternal Order of Police, Philadelphia. He spoke in favor of legislation allowing police access to the welfare records to attain addresses a fugitive felons.

Bradley who was arrested after being a runaway for ten years for murder...(from end of last month)

Welfare offices have refused to give these names and addresses of fugitive felons to police...Someone sued them for having been caught using that method, and the judge said it was invasion of his privacy.

With RS, was the legal counsel to the Fraternal Order of Police, Philadelphia. He spoke in favor of legislation allowing police access to the welfare records to attain addresses a fugitive felons.

TO: Stuart
FROM: Scott

Pittsburgh - Duquense University School of Law
3/7/94 5:00 P.M.
Town Meeting
Health Care Reform
Duquense Law Ctr. Women's Association
Approximately 100, mostly law students and faculty
Favorable response
no evident media

After arriving 10 minutes late RS gave a highly critical overview of the Clinton health care plan and revealed the highlights of his own alternative. Santorum spoke for nearly 40 minutes and then took questions from those in attendance. He was only given the opportunity to answer a few questions before being cut off by a law professor eager to teach a class in the lecture hall.

RS expressed the view that the Clinton plan was nothing more than a big government attempt to take over the health care system. He made a concerted effort to link Sen. Wofford to the Clinton plan and even referred to the Clinton plan as the "Clinton\Wofford" plan. The structure of his argument against the Clinton plan consisted of several erroneous beliefs. Under the Clinton Plan ~~health care will be free. When something is free people use it too much.~~ Therefore the government will not be able to adhere to its Global Budget and consequently it will be necessary to ration care. Santorum once again compared the problems associated with hunger in the 1960's to the health care problem in the 1990's. This belief is predicated on the view that the problem is one of access. Food stamps have increased access to food, so too would Health Stamps or vouchers increase access to health care. Santorum does not say whether he would vote against the needed \$ as he often does with food stamps. In addition Rick compared the appointees of the state health care board to the Turnpike commission which is both appointed by the state government and very unpopular. Santorum does not say whether he would vote against the needed \$ as he often does with food stamps. In addition Rick compared the appointees of the state health care board to the Turnpike commission which is both appointed by the state government and very unpopular.

Town Meeting began by telling the crowd why he was conducting this Health Care Reform
Duquense Law Ctr. Women's Association
Approximately 100, mostly law students and faculty
Favorable response
no evident media

After arriving 10 minutes late RS gave a highly critical overview of the Clinton health care plan and revealed the highlights of his own alternative. Santorum spoke for nearly 40 minutes and then took questions from those in attendance. He was only given the opportunity to answer a few questions before being cut off by a law professor eager to teach a class in the lecture

NEVER
HEARD OF A
WALL ST
PROPOSAL?

have. If you are sick and you need health care, you get health care. No one is turned away at a hospital - a because of their inability to pay." This is an access to insurance problem and all of the focus from the president on down talks about how we insure more people. That's number one, number two is the cost issue. None of you would be here, Bill Clinton may not be the President, Harris Wofford probably would not be the Senator if the cost of health care were not going up in excess of the rate of inflation. We would not be in a health care crisis. We would not even be considering it a health care problem."

RS believes that he knows the strategy that the President will employ in order to pass his health care plan. "So the insured question is the one that the President and those who are trying to drive this issue from the left are going to use to convince you that their system is best. Their going to argue that universal access, universal coverage is the real key here and that's the real important issue. That's the tough one to solve. The fact of the matter is it isn't. The tougher of the two problems is cost not access. Its easy to bring everybody into the system it depends on how you want to do it. You can get everyone insured that's not the problem. That is not hard. The Clinton Administration bares that out. There are 1342 pages in the Clinton Health Bill, 19 are devoted to access. 19 guarantee insurance. The other 1323 pages talks about how the government controls costs by taking over the health care system. But it is easy to bring people in. The question is once everybody is in the system how do you control costs. The problem with the Clinton plan is they bring everybody in with this card that can never be taken away. Gives you the card to go out and get as much care as you need given the benefits that are given to you under the plan. A a -- the problem is that every other country that has given people a card to go out and get all the health care they want. They have a little problem its called cost. Once you give people something for free, they have a tendency to use it - it more than if they have had to pay for it. P.J. O'Rourke said if you think health care is expensive now wait until its free." It is unclear as to how this is free health care given the employee contribution and the deductibles and copays that will still be a part of the system.

It is unclear as to how this is free health care given the employee contribution and the deductibles and copays that will still be a part of the system.

Santorum used a schematic diagram to illustrate what he thinks health care would be like if the cost of health care were not going up in excess of the rate of inflation. We would not be in a health care crisis. We would not even be considering it a health care problem."

RS believes that he knows the strategy that the President will employ in order to pass his health care plan. "So the insured question is the one that the President and those who are trying to drive this issue from the left are going to use to convince you that their system is best. Their going to argue that universal access, universal coverage is the real key here and that's the real important issue. That's the tough one to solve. The fact of the matter is it isn't. The tougher of the two problems is cost not access. Its easy to bring everybody into the system it depends on

Rick demonstrated that he will use fear, scare tactics and even lies in an effort to preserve the status quo by preventing real health care reform. This is especially true of the Global Budget aspect of the Clinton Plan. RS cited the Netherlands, Canada and even the Soviet Union as nations that used and could not meet Global Budgets and therefore had to ration care. "That's how the system works now, how do they control costs, I said premium caps, and what happens in other areas around the world. Every other country that puts on a Global Budget like Canada, The Netherlands, -- The Soviet Union. - A - they ration care, in Canada if you want to get a heart by pass, you go to the university and find out you have three arteries clogged. A 30 week wait. 30 weeks to wait for heart surgery. There are more people that die waiting for heart by pass surgery in Canada than that die on the table. ... That's how they enforce it, they limit the amount of money available and therefore they limit your access to the system."

It was Canada though that Rick used to instill the greatest fear in the participants at this meeting. "Did anyone see what happened up in Canada last year? Anybody? Nobody - Nobody saw what happened to the health care system in Canada in December - one person. Phil Musik was talking about this on the radio the other night and he said he didn't believe it, we sent him an article and now he believes it. A - the health care system in Canada in Ontario, the largest province, 1/3 of the population, they have Global Budgets up there. They tell the people that practice in Ontario this is how much money you can spend on health care this year. And they ran out of money, so they shut the hospitals down for three weeks. They shut them down for three weeks - closed over half of the beds. The only beds they didn't close were obstetrics, they didn't make people cross their legs, we can deliver babies, we can take trauma, and if you're in intensive care we will let you stay. If you're in need of cancer surgery you have to wait until after the first of the year. If you're in need of anything else you wait three weeks - o.k. - not one major network reported it. Not One - major network. There was an article and I don't usually compliment the Washington Post but there was an article in the Washington Post. There certainly wasn't one in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. This is a major aspect of the Clinton Plan and don't kid Not One - major network. There was an article and I don't usually compliment the Washington Post but there was an article in the Washington Post. There certainly wasn't one in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. This is a major aspect of the Clinton Plan and don't kid yourself. This is exactly what the CBO said would happen. There will be rationing." Perhaps RS is not a congressman at all, this rendition appears to be nothing more than an audition for a HIAA television commercial.

BET
BET
BET

The onslaught did continue with more discussion of Canada and Global budgets in general and what Santorum said was called a RAE day in specific. "In Canada they're called RAE days that's days when the hospitals shut down. Its unfortunate we have a video, we don't have it here, but we have a video of the Toronto TV Station reporting on RAE days, a few days before Christmas. At the Mt. ...

please don't bring your small children into the hospital unless they have fevers in excess of 104 degrees and having convulsions or they are non-responsive. That's Global Budgets. That's why the folks who are for Managed Care aren't for the Clinton Plan, because this isn't about competition. This is about controlling costs and the government rationing care. ... This is gonna result in the government basically dictating to you what health care is available when they see fit."

RS reiterates what he would like those attending to get out of this town meeting and regardless of how much one disagrees with the message, Santorum still has the crowd's attention. The message is very structured and he frequently returns to the theme to make certain that the crowd is not confused. "If you want to take one thing away from this discussion - take this. We're gonna do one of three things in this country; nothing, pass the Clinton\Wofford big government federalized kind of plan, or we're going to pass the reform of the marketplace plan. Now each one of those has consequences as it affects your ability to get care when you want it. All right we go with the Wofford\Clinton - - very simple, very simple the federal government will tell you - will make decisions to what you get. It happens in every other country in the world, every other country in the world does this. Do not believe the siren song that somehow it will be different in this country. It will not be - look at the Veterans Administration. If you believe that we will in fact - we will provide the best quality care, for people that we will spend an unlimited amount of money to get them care, walk over to the VA. and see if you want to be treated there as opposed to Presby.[short for Presbyterian Hospital]."

The health care format is very effective at rallying the anti-democratic sentiment for Santorum. This is by in large a result of the scare tactics and the fear that he employs. He does say some very stupid things, however my guess is that too few of those attending either know enough about health care reform or are listening attentively enough to be offended by these comments. "Once there is the demand, the marketplace will develop you'll have all sorts of smart people get in the marketplace and informing you on how to make health care decisions. It will happen and people will save money. Now will there be people who will make bad decisions, - absolutely there certainly will be people who will make bad decisions. The bottom line is, I'd rather have you make when they see fit."

RS reiterates what he would like those attending to get out of this town meeting and regardless of how much one disagrees with the message, Santorum still has the crowd's attention. The message is very structured and he frequently returns to the theme to make certain that the crowd is not confused. "If you want to take one thing away from this discussion - take this. We're gonna do one of three things in this country; nothing, pass the Clinton\Wofford big government federalized kind of plan, or we're going to pass the reform of the marketplace plan. Now each one of those has consequences as it affects your ability to get care when you want it. All right we go with the Wofford\Clinton - - very simple, very simple the federal government will tell you - will make decisions

require all of these benefits to be paid and you simply put people out of work. And its pretty easy. I talk to employers all the of time they tell me listen I can't afford to hire anybody, I can't afford the cost of letting them go. Its just too expensive for me anymore. I mean you know I'm gonna get sued or - - you know whether its the Civil Rights Act or whether its the Americans with Disabilities Act or whether its the Fair Labor Standards Act, or whether its the OSHA act, or whether its the - a - what - they - whether its the Family and Medical Leave Act you can go on and on and on. I mean you just make it too expensive." For a person whose biography brags about being the son of an Italian Immigrant Santorum exhibits no consideration for the rights of regular folks trying to earn a living and support a family. I wonder if Santorum's father experienced the same hostility in his effort to support Rick and create a descent life for his family. Perhaps this supports the idea that Rick was the son of a rich Italian Immigrant.

The idea of business owners being entrenched in excessive government regulations is a recurring theme with Rick that has also been used in his discussions of Welfare reform. RS added a few comments as to exactly what the middle class is and where he sees the middle class going. "We keep putting these regulations, the Clinton kinds of plan on you and this country as we know it is gone. The middle class - the middle class isn't the blue collar worker. The middle class in America traditionally has been the little guy that goes out there and runs that little shop on the corner, that does that little business out of there home. That's the vast majority of the middle class in America. And we're eliminating them. We're just making it absolutely impossible for them to survive in this country. And this is one final nail, the Clinton plan is a final nail in that coffin."

RS was also probed about his views on malpractice reform, this was especially interesting when one considered who the host of this meeting was. One has to give him credit for not doing a flip-flop when asked to reveal his views to a large group of budding young Lawyers. It is to bad though because this could have been a nice hit. Question: "But you're not talking about capping the verdict are you?" Answer: "Some do. Some cap the verdict at 250 thousand, when asked to reveal his views to a large group of budding young Lawyers. It is to bad though because this could have been a nice hit. Question: "But you're not talking about capping the verdict are you?" Answer: "Some do, Some cap the verdict at 250 thousand, some cap fees by which the attorney can earn from the verdict." Question: "But you don't know which one you would support?" Answer: whether its the OSHA act, or whether its the - a - what - they - whether its the Family and Medical Leave Act you can go on and on and on. I mean you just make it too expensive." For a person whose biography brags about being the son of an Italian Immigrant Santorum exhibits no consideration for the rights of regular folks trying to earn a living and support a family. I wonder if Santorum's father experienced the same hostility in his effort to support Rick and create a descent life for his family. Perhaps this supports the idea that Rick was the son of a rich Italian Immigrant.

The idea of business owners being entrenched in excessive government regulations is a recurring theme with Rick that has also

lottery. I mean, no other legal system in the world has our malpractice, you put our malpractice system and throw it in Canada and I mean Edgar Synder [E.S. is an ambulance chasing Pgh. attorney] is the wealthiest guy in the world in that system. Simply because you have people dying on waiting lists. Could you imagine people in America dying on waiting lists, and what Edgar Synder would do?" [Laughter] This is precisely where Santorum seems very effective in conveying his message. He creates a message that is dynamic enough to appeal to an audience, even if many disagree with that message. The laughter seemed to indicate a comfort factor with RS's views. This may not be complete approval, but I see it as an area where he could pick up those who without the town meeting would have been very skeptical.

The discussion on malpractice reform continued with an overview as to how tort reform would fit into his vision of the Clinton Plan. "I mean we just can't have this, you can't have it both ways. You can't have no malpractice and people dying on waiting lists and rationing care - you can't do it." RS went on to suggest that the combination of the above would bankrupt the system because those who die on waiting lists would sue and take money out of the system.

Santorum has serious problems with the government role many foreign nations have in their health care system, but he takes no issue with the relationship between the legal and medical professions. "That's why every other system in the world has taken, you know has a very different standard for measuring what is you know negligent behavior. And negligent behavior according to most systems is not people dying because of a lack of health care. You can't sue for it." Santorum would not advocate changing the smallest detail of our medical system to resemble anything abroad, except the legal system.

Near the end of this session RS returned to his theme and began a final barrage, "that's why the Clinton plan with no malpractice and waiting lines and rationing just doesn't work. There's just not - - not all of the money in the world could make a system like that."

malpractice and waiting lines and rationing just doesn't work. There's just not - - not all of the money in the world could make a system like that."

malpractice and waiting lines and rationing just doesn't work. There's just not - - not all of the money in the world could make a system like that."

RS was warmly revered by the crowd before his departure and after a discussion with the gentleman sitting next to me it appeared as if Santorum had a least one buyer for his message. Judging by the enthusiasm of the crowd, I am sure that he had a significant support base among these folks. These were not regular folks, but I would guess that voter registration is high and what they say about Rick Santorum to their friends and family would garner consideration. The most satisfying part of the entire event could have been that point at which Santorum was cut off by the Law Professor who wanted to teach his class and who obviously was not interested in the message.

rationale behind his alternative. The focus instead was on slamming the Clinton Plan, suggesting a close association between the President and Sen. Wofford and reinforcing the general theme of rationing. If anything is unclear about the theme and language in this memo let me know I could probably recite a large portion of the event from memory.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 10/27/94
Re: RS @ Phila Naval Yards w/ Arlen Specter
Media: WPVI Channel 6, Phila Inquirer, Phila Daily News

Comments:

RS again was late, leaving Specter waiting outside. AS spoke briefly in support of RS' candidacy, saying that, although he had already endorsed him, this was the first time he had done so on TV in Philadelphia. He compared working with RS as "Pennsylvania's next Senator" to working with Sen Heinz, and stressed the Naval Yards as a vital job creator in the area. RS echoed his statements on working together, Sen Heinz, and sticking up for the interests of PA. He then went on to speak about the Naval Yard:

RS: We have to make sure that this, this, this facility is max, the utilization of this facility is maximized; Senator Specter has been taking the lead on that, he needs a viable partner to join him. He needs someone who understands, ah, you know, what the significance of this, and is willing to go out and really fight to make something happen. Who has ideas, who is willing to get involved and get active, and to make a difference, and I

Wiesensee: Rick, in previous years you criticized the Kennedy as pork...

RS: Well, my most recent vote on the Kennedy, you know, is not, and, in fact, I supported the most recent vote, ah, on that. I also, have been a very strong supporter of it. Ah, I had an opportunity to sit down and meet with Jack Murtha, ah, I would say probably a little over a year, a year and a half ago. We talked about the project and I was very much convinced that it was a viable project and was necessary. Ah, there were (?) times, particularly early in my term, in the first term I was in office, when we had to have defense draw downs, and we had cracks to deal with, ah, I had, I had a decision based on the overall was a viable project and was necessary. Ah, there were (?) times, particularly early in my term, in the first term I was in office, when we had to have defense draw downs, and we had cracks to deal with, ah, I had, I had a decision based on the overall funding of the bases all over the country, ah, there were some things I didn't like, there were some bases in my district that closed that I didn't like, but we had, I had to vote on what was the overall best interest, given the fact that we were going to close some bases. Ah, and that's why I supported what I did, it was not something I'm particularly happy to do, because a lot of PA bases were closed...

Wiesensee: Did your position change because you decided to run for Senator?

RS: My position, my position is right now, we have to make the

of the matter is, we were drawing down the defense budget. We're not spending as much money. If you want to elect Harris Wofford and Bill Clinton to go and do their dealings with further defense cuts, you really see some horrific cuts, we've still got millions of people in PA who are working here in the defense industry. I was just out at Superior Tube in Montgomery County, ah, and they were, and we were (?) about the defense industrial bases with respect to the (?) Navy submarine, ah, and I went out and visited them, and my strong support for additional building of the Seawolf Submarine of the two additional Seawolf(?), Senator Wofford is opposed to building the Seawolf Submarine, that [unintell] thousands of jobs here in PA, so if you look across the board, you're going to see someone who's very much supported the defense infrastructure in this country, Harris Wofford has been anti-defense since he got into Congress, he has worked repeatedly against defense funding that means jobs in PA. What we need is someone who recognizes the importance of defense, number one, balance those needs with, obviously budget considerations, and when we have a situation like here at the Navy Yard, someone who's willing to go out and get involved...

were, and we were (?) about the defense industrial bases with respect to the (?) Navy submarine, ah, and I went out and visited them, and my strong support for additional building of the Seawolf Submarine of the two additional Seawolf(?), Senator Wofford is opposed to building the Seawolf Submarine, that [unintell] thousands of jobs here in PA, so if you look across the board, you're going to see someone who's very much supported the defense infrastructure in this country, Harris Wofford has been anti-defense since he got into Congress, he has worked repeatedly against defense funding that means jobs in PA. What we need is someone who recognizes the importance of defense, number one, balance those needs with, obviously budget considerations, and when we have a situation like here at the Navy Yard, someone who's willing to go out and get involved...

memo

to: stu
from: tim and laura
date: 22 october 1994
re: WJET-TV ch.24 News broadcast from the 6pm news

Newscaster: Battle for the US Senate came to Erie this afternoon. Democratic incumbent Sen. Harris Wofford was here to discuss Social Security and to blast a plan presented this week by challenger Rick Santorum. Speaking to an audience made up primarily of seniors, Wofford accused the Allegheny County Congressman of wanting to reduce the budget deficit by raising the Social Security benefit age to 70.

Wofford: I've got 75 billion other deficit cuts, but not raising the age at which people could be eligible for Social Security at a time when more and more people are out of work, retired early, long before they are 70. And I think that proposal that he made last week is dangerous. Maybe that's why the Philadelphia Inquirer, endorsing me, said he is a dangerous candidate.

Santorum: That's the type of demagoguery that I would expect from Sen. Wofford. He knows very well I don't want to raise the age of Social Security on senior citizens in Social Security. I'm talking about raising the age for people who are going to retire in 20 or 30 years. Because, right now, the Social Security system is going to be bankrupt in 2029. And if we don't do something, all the money that we're paying in, the 15% payroll tax that we pay now, will be for naught.

Newscaster: Congressman Santorum was at a Millcreek Business [Industrial Sales] addressing one of his top priorities, job growth. He blasted Wofford for doing nothing as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee and for running a negative campaign for the past seven weeks. Santorum also challenged Wofford to come up with his own plan to save Social Security.

10/18

memo

to: stu
from: tim
date: 10/18 October 1994
time: 9 pm
location: Squirrel Hill Jewish Community Center
type of event: meet the candidates night with question
crowd description: about 250 people, all Jewish, all middle/ upper class
attending media: none noticed

Rural Electrical Co-Ops:

RS: What I've proposed is a whole laundry list of things. One of them was to eliminate rural electrical subsidies. Just to give you an idea what's involved with that, the rural electrical cooperatives were cooperatives that were created back in the 1930's when rural communities didn't have electricity. And so what they- They were built up to provide subsidies to these little cooperatives so they could get electricity. Well a lot of these communities don't- are not rural any more. Aspen, Colorado is a rural enter- cooperative. So is Hilton Head Island. So is Falls Church, Virginia. Now these aren't exactly poor impoverished areas that need subsidies from the federal government. And so what I did was proposed to eliminate the subsidies for these things. You have government loans from the government, with money behind them, but they wouldn't be subsidized loans. Now, I don't have it with me, but I think, the rural electrical coops, and there are a lot of them in Pennsylvania, have been sent out mailing, and, I mean, they've got my picture, and they've got a little Ghostbuster's sign through it, and they put out an article in their magazine. They have for the past three issues about how terrible, horrible Rick Santorum is, and how he is against the rural way of life because of my cuts in rural electric, but it's hard to do. Everybody you cut- even something that seems obvious as a program that has outlived it's usefulness, like the Tennessee Valley Authority which I proposed to cut. Because when the TVA was created when the Tennessee Valley didn't have electricity. You know, they taper all sorts of programs now, and we pick \$2 billion a year, so they could have cheaper power, so they can take our jobs and sent them to Tennessee, because Duquesne Light has the third highest rates in the country. TVA was created when the Tennessee Valley didn't have electricity, so they taper all sorts of programs now, and we pick \$2 billion a year, so they could have cheaper power, so they can take our jobs and sent them to Tennessee, because Duquesne Light has the third highest rates in the country. Now, is that fair? Should we be paying that to TVA so they can do it? No. You try to cut TVA. They're a very powerful lobby down there. They've got all sorts of

type of event: meet the candidates night with question
crowd description: about 250 people, all Jewish, all middle/ upper class
attending media: none noticed

Rural Electrical Co-Ops:

RS: What I've proposed is a whole laundry list of things. One of them was to eliminate rural electrical subsidies. Just to give you an idea what's involved with that, the rural electrical cooperatives were cooperatives that were created back in the 1930's when rural communities didn't have electricity. And so what they- They were built up to provide subsidies to these little cooperatives so they could

is a Part A and a Part B. Part A you pay for over the course of your life; you pay taxes into a Medicare trust fund which, by the way, will be broke in two years. You pay taxes into the Medicare trust fund, and out of those taxes you get benefit Part A, which is hospitalization. Part B is a program that you choose to participate in after you turn 65. You can; you don't have to; it's a voluntary program, but it's a subsidized program. It is not subsidized by the tax dollars you paid in to a Medicare trust fund. It is subsidized by tax dollars outside of Medicare and Social Security subsidized by the federal fund. What we do with this program is we, we we- It's a very good deal for seniors. They pay like forty or forty-one dollars or something like that toward the cost of the Medicare Part B payment, premium. That takes care of that premium that they pay monthly. It takes care of 25% of the cost of the program. It is 75% is picked up the general fund by tax payers. My suggestion, is we shouldn't be subsidizing high income seniors on a voluntary program that they didn't contribute to over the course of their life. But if you are high income that you can afford to pay a higher premium, you shouldn't have people who are 25 years old with two kids and no health insurance paying taxes to subsidize people who 65 years old and who have- you know, in our proposal, having incomes above \$100,000 a year. Now, that's fair- In my mind that's a fair way to go about it. And people who have the means to be able to pay for it, should at least pay more of the cost of the program. We phase it in. You don't pay the full amount of what you actually get, as a benefit from the program, until you make \$200,000 a year. And every seniors group in the world is against it. And I have been accused, as I will continue to be accused by my opponents because I support that for Medicare cuts. That's considered a cut. That gets you very nasty ads on television- that you're for cutting Medicare.

The Christian Right:

The person asking the question about RS's involvement mentioned that RS spent \$2700 to "cultivate the Christian Coalition."

RS: I do not support putting organized prayer in public schools. I never have. I know Senator Wofford has dug up every conceivable paper that I ever wrote, but he never accused me of that as far as I know. I do get the label of being, as you suggested, because I receive from organizations that are Christian Organizations. I hope that we aren't in a position in this country but because you receive contributions from Christian Organizations that that makes you in line with everything that that organization believes. I don't think that Senator Wofford, who receives contributions from lots of organizations, that are not paid in to a Medicare trust fund. It is subsidized by tax dollars outside of Medicare and Social Security subsidized by the federal fund. What we do with this program is we, we we- It's a very good deal for seniors. They pay like forty or forty-one dollars or something like that toward the cost of the Medicare Part B payment, premium. That takes care of that premium that they pay monthly. It takes care of 25% of the cost of the program. It is 75% is picked up the general fund by tax payers. My suggestion, is we shouldn't be subsidizing high income seniors on a voluntary program that they didn't contribute to over the course of their life. But if you are high income that you can afford to pay a higher premium, you shouldn't have people who are 25 years old with two kids and no health insurance paying taxes to subsidize people who 65 years old and who have- you know, in our proposal, having incomes above \$100,000 a year. Now, that's fair- In my mind that's a fair way to go about it. And people who have the

election I have never been called a religious rightist. You know, I go to church every Sunday. If that somehow makes me a religious rightist, I don't know where- There is room, but I hope still for religion in people's lives who are in politics. I don't walk away from my religion. I'm proud of my religion, as I'm sure you are proud of your's. Do I inter- Do I impose my religion on anybody else? Absolutely not. But I am a public official, and I am responsible to people who elect me, and I will continue to be responsible to the people who elect me. And, you know, I just hope that that- It bothers me. It really bothers me to see this kind of religious bigotry that seems to be cropping up because you have a group of people who want to get active and involved in government. Now, you know that's their right to do. We certainly don't want to tell them they can't do it, and if they want to participate in the process, my goodness, I hope they- I hope that we're going to allow them and say just because someone-- I mean, these aren't people who are going out there burning crosses or anything. These are people who are good, sound Americans.

They may not agree with everything that you agree with. Now that doesn't make them bad people. And that doesn't make them not have the opportunity to have a voice. Now, if you look at my rating with the Christian Coalition; well, it's 74%. Now, I don't consider that- I mean, yea, I agree with them more often than I disagree with them, but that's part of the religious rightist. I just would suggest to look at the record. I mean, I don't support organized prayer in school. I don't support- I mean, they support abolishing the NEA. I vote against it every year, and I hear about it every year. I don't vote for mandatory school vouchers in school. I vote for voluntary because I think it's up to the school district to determine that, not me.

A question came regarding filibustering, and whether he act to change the filibuster rules.

RS: No, I wouldn't change the filibuster rules. I think the filibuster rules are very proper rules and have been in this country since, since I can remember, and they may have been around since, since the beginning of our, of our republic. I'd also like to remind you that Senator Wofford in the last session of Congress voted for eight filibusters. He voted not to end cloture. And most of those votes had to do with legal liability reform. So he is not immune from being in gridlocker himself. Both sides of the isle use filibusters, and they have for a long, long time. And it's now, all of a sudden, been sort of fashionable to blame Republicans and their filibusters. All I would suggest is that, like I think we'd, elect me, and I will continue to be responsible to the people who elect me. And, you know, I just hope that that- It bothers me. It really bothers me to see this kind of religious bigotry that seems to be cropping up because you have a group of people who want to get active and involved in government. Now, you know that's their right to do. We certainly don't want to tell them they can't do it, and if they want to participate in the process, my goodness, I hope they- I hope that we're going to allow them and say just because someone-- I mean, these aren't people who are going out there burning crosses or anything. These are people who are good, sound Americans.

They may not agree with everything that you agree with. Now that doesn't make them bad people. And that doesn't make them not have the opportunity to have a voice. Now, if you look at my rating with the Christian Coalition; well,

MEMO

To: Pat/Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 10/13/94
Re: Dawn Shurmaitis' Interrogation of RS @ Wilkes-Barre PC

Comments:

RS opened the Q & A period by announcing that Mayor Connors had just informed him that the city of Scranton will receive no funding for new police officers under the Crime Bill. In her questions, Shurmaitis brought up the fact that Wilkes-Barre was to receive funding, and used that to question RS' implication that the crime bill was a politically motivated payoff to big city mayors. She also questioned him thoroughly on rehabilitation:

DS: What I'm hearing is 'lock 'em up and throw away the key'; do you believe there is a role for rehabilitation?

RS: Yeah. You know, rehabilitation is part of the criminal justice system now. The question is, how much, you know, how much more money do you want to spend on it, how much more do you want to do?

DS: Answer that question. How much more money do you want to spend?

RS: I don't think we, I frankly don't think we need to spend any more money than we spend right now.

DS: Would you cut rehabilitation funds?

RS: I cannot say that, at this point, that I would cut rehabilitation funds, but I don't believe that we should spend more on it. You know, this crime bill is more prevention and rehabilitation, and, ah, look, we spend \$3 billion a year on those kinds of programs. Three billion dollars. rehabilitation funds, more on it. You know, this crime bill is more prevention and rehabilitation, and, ah, look, we spend \$3 billion a year on those kinds of programs. Three billion dollars.

DS: Define 'those programs'.

Comments:

RS opened the Q & A period by announcing that Mayor Connors had just informed him that the city of Scranton will receive no funding for new police officers under the Crime Bill. In her questions, Shurmaitis brought up the fact that Wilkes-Barre was to receive funding, and used that to question RS' implication that the crime bill was a politically motivated payoff to big city mayors. She also questioned him thoroughly on rehabilitation:

DS: What I'm hearing is 'lock 'em up and throw away the key'; do you believe there is a role for rehabilitation?

RS: Absolutely. I have not had one taxpayer ever come up to me and say 'Congressman, I don't want to spend any more money on jails because I want criminals to be in my neighborhood.'

DS: How much do you propose spending?

RS: Whatever is necessary to put the people away who are committing the crimes. If you committed a crime -

DS: Would you raise taxes in order to -

RS: I don't think you have to raise taxes. I think there's, I mean, there's \$3 billion in prevention programs that are a pretty good target, ah -

DS: So you would take funding from prevention programs to build more jails?

RS: If that's what's necessary, I'd look at, I'd look at the ah, ah, the Justice, the Department of Appropriations, ah, and find out where we can squeeze money. I think most people would trade midnight basketball for a few extra cells.

[WBRE reporter breaks in, asks about RS' record on crime. RS goes into flaws in crime bill]

RS:...some of the ideas that are in the crime bill are, are in fact good ideas, that, that, that, that unfortunately, it was just a very bad mix, and, and unfortunately, like we've seen here, a lot of communities that, ah, that deserve police officers, under the formulas are, that were put together by this bill, just simply aren't going to get them. I mean, this was a big city mayor pay off. And, ah, that's where the money's going to go.

[Shurmaitis asks if RS knows a Luzerne Co judge HW also voted for, RS doesn't, discussion of whether TV crews have enough footage. Resume questions.]

~~Reporter:~~ How could it be that there's no money for Scranton in for, RS doesn't, discussion of whether TV crews have enough footage. Resume questions.]

Reporter: How could it be that there's no money for Scranton in this crime bill?

RS: Whatever is necessary to put the people away who are committing the crimes. If you committed a crime -

DS: Would you raise taxes in order to -

RS: I don't think you have to raise taxes. I think there's, I mean, there's \$3 billion in prevention programs that are a pretty good target, ah -

DS: So you would take funding from prevention programs to build more jails?

RS: If that's what's necessary, I'd look at, I'd look at the ah, ah, the Justice, the Department of Appropriations, ah, and find

DS: So you're saying that's why Wilkes-Barre got money and police officers, was this a favor that they gave -

RS: Well, all, I think it's slanted, I think it's slanted toward, ah, cities that do things that are in line with what this administration wants them to do.

DS: Is that Wilkes-Barre then?

RS: Well, if, if they've got, if they've got the money, I would take a look at, at their policies, and, if they can jump through the hoops that they've set down then I'm suggesting they're probably jumping through hoops, ah, that, that, that Washington wants them to jump through. And I, I just don't think that that's what, I think, cities should get money based on a per capita allocation. Period. There's no reason for Scranton not to get money, there's just as many people in Scranton who are afraid of crime as there are in Wilkes-Barre.

DS: So this was a politically motivated -

RS: Sure, I mean, it was structured to make sure that, that, that cities that, that, that, ah, that complied with the, with the, with the hoops that, ah, the federal government set up, got the money and those that didn't didn't get the money. And that's, that's pretty simple. I mean, obviously if it was a per capita thing both cities would have gotten police officers and they didn't.

[Reporter asks if RS would rectify situation if elected Senator. Comes back to Wilkes-Barre]

RS: Well, I mean, Wilkes-Barre can have all the cops they want, I have no problem with Wilkes-Barre getting money -

DS: You're saying the reason why Wilkes-Barre got it was political.

RS: No no no no. The reason why, I mean, let me explain this one more time. The reason Wilkes-Barre got it is because they qualify under the provisions that were written into the law. They wrote into the law certain, certain provisions -

DS: No no no no. The reason why, I mean, let me explain this one more time. The reason Wilkes-Barre got it is because they qualify under the provisions that were written into the law. They wrote into the law certain, certain provisions -

DS: No no no no. The reason why, I mean, let me explain this one more time. The reason Wilkes-Barre got it is because they qualify under the provisions that were written into the law. They wrote into the law certain, certain provisions -

DS: So that only cities with Democratic mayors -

RS: No no no no no no no. Only, only, only cities that had certain, and we can get you the list of, of things, I mean, one of them that, was the hiring practices, one of them had to do with, ah, you know, some of it, some of it was statistical,

football, at all. I mean, these are formula grants. But the question is, the question is, the formula was concocted and how it was biased, toward certain cities not others. I, I, this is not -

DS: What was the bias based on?

RS: I'll be happy to get you the information, on how, on how they structured the grant. Ah, and, instead of, as I supported, a flat per capita formula, this was, they had other provisions in there that, in my opinion tilted it toward, toward certain cities and against others. Now, I'm not gonna tell you that they sat down in Washington and figured 'We're going to give money to Scranton and not Wilkes-Barre(sic)', that's ridiculous, of course they didn't. It just so happened that that's what happened. But it shouldn't happen that way, is my point.

FAX: 302-544-7773

MEMORANDUM

To: Stewart Trevelyan
From: Wendy Dillon
Date: March 1, 1994

Re: Rick Santorum Healthcare Discussion with University of
Pittsburgh Young Republicans, (February 28, 1994)

Santorum began with the standard opening of who he is, what he is, and how it is time for a Republican to speak for the people of Pennsylvania. He mentioned that he had a major announcement to make in the near future and alluded to the fact that it was regarding a health care bill he was intending to sponsor. He did not, however, elaborate on this bill.

The health discussion entailed Santorum's use of Clinton's plan, etc. which mainly discussed his argument that Clinton's plan would disrupt the healthcare coverage that Pennsylvanians currently have. He gave a figure that currently only 8.1% of Pennsylvanians are uninsured. He also spoke of a response by Hillary Clinton at a House and Means hearing that under the Clinton plan approximately 4% of Pennsylvanians would still be uninsured. Santorum also harped on the bureaucracy that the Clinton plan will create, giving a figure that almost 106 new federal bureaucratic agencies will be created. Santorum's big push was that his plan would provide access to healthcare for all Americans, but not universal coverage. He analogized the healthcare problem to that of food stamps, and suggested that as the solution of food stamps works to provide food to Americans, the Republican plan would provide a voucher to a voucher system for Americans to receive healthcare.

My first question was "What protection will a plan with a \$5000 deductible offer one, a student, and the average American?" His response began by stating that the deductible was in fact \$3000, not \$5000. Next he began a discussion of how employers will pay employees the \$3000 which will be debited to the employees (describing a "debit card" type system) for future healthcare needs throughout the year. I then followed with a question as to how this would be effective for a student with no income or the impact it would have on small businesses unable to pay a \$3000 deductible for each employee. He then said that it was complicated but he would

tried to explain to how it would work with tax exclusions and tax credits, asking if I was familiar with these concepts. He explained that employees would get tax exclusions for the dependables and those without dependables would get tax credits. I then asked that I was under the impression that in order for a taxpayer to benefit from a tax credit they must have some source of income from which to receive the credit. I asked again how as a student I would benefit from this when I had no income. He then went on to discuss how the majority of Pennsylvanians purchased term life insurance year and chose not to purchase insurance. When I asked a question that related to my previous question one of his aides stood up and said they had to move on to other questions. I had asked 2 questions in the audience but Santorum only answered 1 of the questions and then ended. One question was regarding the reduction of the estate tax which he dismissed by saying gun control is more important. Another question was raised about the reduction of the estate tax which he said was going for Rick Warren to engage in how Dan Quayle and others have been believed in regarding say something about creating 53,000 jobs through National Guard. He then put me in the audience people to make decisions on their own.

Overall Santorum did a poor job of answering questions. He was doing a poor job of answering questions in his position. The crowd was respectful but not overly impressed. The majority of the group seemed to be from the Democratic side. As an aside Channel 3's news anchor, Tom Santorum, left after his introduction.

If you have any questions please give me a call.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 10/01/94
Re: KS @ PA Pro Life Federation

Comments:

RS was expected to speak at this event, attended by almost 200 pro-lifers, until KS showed up in his stead at 9 PM. Clearly much preparation had gone into this event - there was a stage covered in red, white and blue bunting, tinsel and flags, and a straw hat with a red, white and blue hat band on each chair in the audience. There was also a camera crew (four? men, two big lights, two cameras with monitors), I think they were making a video for the Federation's use. The meeting began with a prayer led by a Monsignor (no mention of RS), and the Pledge of Allegiance. The PA Pro Life Federation Legislative Director gave a brief explanation as to why RS was not there, ("I'm sure everyone here has seen the negative Carville ads that have been on the TV against Congressman Santorum, who's running against Wofford for the US Senate. Well, Congressman, unfortunately Congressman Santorum was called to Washington for a vote today, we all know how important that is that he make that vote..."). (NB: House adjourned at 5:24 PM, and then introduced Karen Santorum as "the wife of our next US Senator from Pennsylvania". KS spoke for about 25 min., following an almost identical format to RS' generic speeches. She began by "setting the record straight":

KS: Unlike another political spouse who is also a lawyer, I enjoy making tea and cookies with my children.

On family values and school prayer:

KS: Rick and I believe that type of government policies that his opponent supports have a lot to do with the break down of the family....Harris Wofford was the deciding vote giving us biggest tax increase in the history of this country. and thanks to him we
KS: Rick and I believe that type of government policies that his opponent supports have a lot to do with the break down of the family....Harris Wofford was the deciding vote giving us biggest tax increase in the history of this country, and thanks to him we now work January, February, March, April and May just to pay taxes... And thanks to the government we don't allow prayer or

Comments:

RS was expected to speak at this event, attended by almost 200 pro-lifers, until KS showed up in his stead at 9 PM. Clearly much preparation had gone into this event - there was a stage covered in red, white and blue bunting, tinsel and flags, and a straw hat with a red, white and blue hat band on each chair in the audience. There was also a camera crew (four? men, two big lights, two cameras with monitors), I think they were making a video for the Federation's use. The meeting began with a prayer led by a Monsignor (no mention of RS), and the Pledge of Allegiance. The PA Pro Life Federation Legislative Director gave a brief explanation as to why RS was not there, ("I'm sure

KS: And Rick Santorum has fought against every Congressional pay raise, and despite what Harris Wofford is saying, Rick has never taken a pay raise. I know, because I write that check every month. And when our refrigerator broke last month, it would have been nice to have had that money.

On HW and the failure of Health Care:

KS: He failed because the American people did not want to buy what he was selling, namely socialized medicine that mandated abortion services.

KS never directly addressed abortions or being pro-life, although she did accept a plaque from the Federation on Rick's behalf, awarded for his having a 100% voting record on pro-life issues.

KS: He failed because the American people did not want to buy what he was selling, namely socialized medicine that mandated abortion services.

KS never directly addressed abortions or being pro-life, although she did accept a plaque from the Federation on Rick's behalf, awarded for his having a 100% voting record on pro-life issues.

Santorum Event

TO: Stuart and Max

FROM: Tim

LOCATION: Arlington, Virginia, Crystal City Marriott

DATE: 14 April 1994

TYPE OF MEETING: Speech in conference on Self-Sufficiency and Low
Wage Labor Market: A Reality Check for Welfare Reform

SUBJECT: Welfare

SPONSOR: The Urban Institute

CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 100 civil servants from around the country

MEDIA COVERAGE: Gannett-Jerry Maskell, Bloomsberg Business News-
David Ahern, Medill News Service-Lauren Howard

The purpose of RS at this meeting was to have a Republican Congressman demonstrate his "expert" views on welfare reform. There were no references to the Senatorial Race or to HW. The presentation was his usual town meeting welfare talk, minus the attacks on HW and the pleading for donations.

He did, in fact, stray from the normal track to address the criticism of Jack Kemp in the April 14 edition of the Washington Times. Kemp's criticism on RS's plan was directed toward the illegitimacy problem; Kemp believes RS's plan is too soft on illegitimacy and governmental support for unwed mothers. RS stated,

"I think it is an interesting theory that, in fact, we experiment or demonstrate whether, in fact, it is a workable theory. And we do it on the population that is the most likely to be impacted positively by this. And for two other reasons, number one, the population we focus in on are children having children, minors. And we experiment. We say to minors, in this bill, if you have child out of wedlock and you're a minor, you will no longer receive any cash benefits."

He continued,

"We think that's a very strong signal to a group, as I said before, which are the most likely to end up on welfare, if you have a child out of wedlock and you're a minor, number one."

"We think that's a very strong signal to a group, as I said before, which are the most likely to end up on welfare, if you have a child out of wedlock and you're a child, number one. Number two, they're the most likely to be the long term
"Wage Labor Market: A Reality Check for Welfare Reform"

SUBJECT: Welfare

SPONSOR: The Urban Institute

CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 100 civil servants from around the country

MEDIA COVERAGE: Gannett-Jerry Maskell, Bloomsberg Business News-
David Ahern, Medill News Service-Lauren Howard

The purpose of RS at this meeting was to have a Republican Congressman demonstrate his "expert" views on welfare reform. There were no references to the Senatorial Race or to HW. The presentation was his usual town meeting welfare talk, minus the attacks on HW and the pleading for donations.

He did, in fact, stray from the normal track to address the

To: STU
From: DAVE C.
Date: 10/15/94
Re: Senatorial Debate, WPVI, 10/14/94

October 14, 1994

Televised Senatorial Debate: Channel 6 (WPVI)

Participants: Diane Blough (Patriot), Rick Santorum (Republican),
Donald Ernsberger (Libertarian), Harris Wofford (Democrat)

Moderated by Marc Howard

League of Women Voters welcome.

Introductions of candidates.

MH: In the last twenty-four hours or so there has been a good deal of discussion and troop movement in the Middle East, Kuwait, Iraq, and a lot of questions not yet answered about what the US should do in that area. We also this weekend will see the return of the president of Haiti, also through the good help of troops from the US. The real question is, how much military involvement should the US get in this process, how often, and what is too little or too much?

DB: Well, what is our military about? Our military is about protecting our nation. Our security. We have become, however, the watchdogs of the world, the police of the world, even social work. So I think we have to decide exactly what will be our foreign policy because right now we don't have one. We are reactionary rather than proactive. So I think we should think of three things when we're talking about our foreign policy. That is our national security, number two would be our economic strength, and number three, our industrial base. Right now we've lost our economic strength, and we've lost our industrial base. So, the thing we have left is our defense, and our defense is being watered down every day.

three, our industrial base. Right now we've lost our economic strength, and we've lost our industrial base. So, the thing we have left is our defense, and our defense is being watered down every day.

RS: Thank you. This is an issue that's very important to the future of this
October 14, 1994

Televised Senatorial Debate: Channel 6 (WPVI)

Participants: Diane Blough (Patriot), Rick Santorum (Republican),
Donald Ernsberger (Libertarian), Harris Wofford (Democrat)

Moderated by Marc Howard

League of Women Voters welcome.

Introductions of candidates.

MH: In the last twenty-four hours or so there has been a good deal of

country is at risk. And unfortunately we have a president who doesn't do that. I support the president in Iraq. I think he has a good playbook to follow from. If he looks at what President Bush did against Saddam Hussein, he can follow that chart pretty clearly. And he's doing that right now. I support him 100% in the action he's taken so far. I hope he continues that course.

DE: I want to start by thanking the LOWV and WPVI for inviting all of the candidates this evening to this debate. I want to thank them for standing firm when RS suggested that I be excluded. The issue is foreign affairs. The Cold War is over. We are no longer constitutionally, fiscally, or morally responsible to be the world's policeman. Nor should we be the world's social worker. I have consistently opposed American intervention around the world. Whether a Republican president or a Democratic was the interventionist president. Our problems in this country of national debt, taxes, and economic decay are too severe for us to take on the role of the world's policeman. I believe a complete reexamination of American foreign policy is necessary. And what we need and what I have proposed in my budget proposals is a drastic reduction in American overseas involvement, closing down bases around the world. We still defend Japan and Germany with billions of dollars in defense expenditures, when these two countries are among the richest on earth. It's time to reexamine and to pull back American intervention everywhere on earth.

HW: Diane, Rick, Don. I agree with Don that we have troops that can come home from overseas, and I pressed successfully to get 100,000 less troops stationed in Europe, which doesn't need us any more, at a savings of billions of dollars. But when I was in the service in WWII the one thing I knew was that I didn't want politicians turning a military mission at a time of peril into politics. We have young men and women from PA in Haiti today, successfully seeing a transition without an invasion, a transition to the restoration to the first democratically elected president there. It may happen peacefully tomorrow. But no mixed signals from politicians. I supported the Persian Gulf action by President Bush, a president of another party, and I think there were some mixed signals there, but no mixed signals now. Our president and our policy there is steady, strong, and we're going to win. Persian Gulf action by President Bush, a president of another party, and I think there were some mixed signals there, but no mixed signals now. Our president and our policy there is steady, strong, and we're going to win.

DE: I want to start by thanking the LOWV and WPVI for inviting all of the candidates this evening to this debate. I want to thank them for standing firm when RS suggested that I be excluded. The issue is foreign affairs. The Cold War is over. We are no longer constitutionally, fiscally, or morally responsible to be the world's policeman. Nor should we be the world's social worker. I have consistently opposed American intervention around the world. Whether a Republican president or a Democratic was the interventionist president. Our problems in this country of national debt, taxes, and economic decay are too severe for us to take on the role of the world's policeman. I believe a complete reexamination of American foreign policy is necessary. And what we need and what I have proposed in my budget proposals is a drastic reduction in American overseas involvement, closing

example, are far more involved in the Middle East than US interest.

MH: Ms Blough, what do you think about speaking out about it while the troops are there?

DB: Well, I don't agree with our troops in Haiti, but I certainly do agree with our troops that are in Iraq. (MH: and as far as speaking out against it, you think that that's perfectly in order, even though they're in some sense in harm's way in Haiti?) Speaking out against the troops being there? (MH: yeah) That's perfectly OK.

RS: Well, this is a perfect example of where Harris Wofford has been a mouthpiece of this administration. What he's done is just simply do whatever Bill Clinton's objectives are, irrespective of what the national interest is. (HW: not correct, congressman) In the case of Haiti, he supported, was one of the few US senators that supported the invasion of Haiti, and then criticized me prior to the invasion for putting at risk our national security by questioning whether we should invade. This isn't a question of whether we're supporting troops while they're on the ground. This was a question of discussion in this campaign about whether we should be there in the first place, and he has been an absolute lapdog on this issue, and I think that's in the best interest of PA

MH: You want to clarify?

HW: As usual, the congressman has his facts all wrong. I did not support the invasion of Haiti. (RS: that's not true) I do not undermine the mission while it's underway. I did vote to ask the president to come to Congress to consult with us before he did. No president in modern times has taken that rule from Congress, but I think it's the right rule. And once again, the congressman has got his facts all mixed up.

DE: The problem with Republicans and Democrats is that whenever a Republican president sends in the troops all the Republicans rally, and then

DE: The problem with Republicans and Democrats is that whenever a Republican president sends in the troops all the Republicans rally, and then the Democrats criticize (RS: I want everybody to recognize that I support the president's intervention in Iraq) (HW: and I supported Panama, Granada) . . . with our troops that are in Iraq. (MH: and as far as speaking out against it, you think that that's perfectly in order, even though they're in some sense in harm's way in Haiti?) Speaking out against the troops being there? (MH: yeah) That's perfectly OK.

RS: Well, this is a perfect example of where Harris Wofford has been a mouthpiece of this administration. What he's done is just simply do whatever Bill Clinton's objectives are, irrespective of what the national interest is. (HW: not correct, congressman) In the case of Haiti, he supported, was one of the few US senators that supported the invasion of Haiti, and then criticized me prior to the invasion for putting at risk our national security by questioning whether we should invade. This isn't a

MH: Well, a difference of opinion. That's why we're here. Let's talk about health care now. Two years ago, Harris Wofford became the senator from PA in large part, I think it's fair to say, on a wave of health care. The senator at the time said that he thought that every American has a right to health care just as every criminal has a right to a defense lawyer. So now we are here two years later; a health-care bill did not pass, but it's possible that there will be a health-care bill brought up again in the next Congress. And in order of the draw. Mr. Santorum, you're next. Tell us what if anything you would do about a health-care bill in January.

RS: Well I've actually introduced my own health reform bill that address the two major problems that confront this country. Number one, of getting people into the system, and we've provided insurance reform to make sure that everybody who wants insurance can get it, and subsidies to help people who can't afford it to get that insurance. The second thing we've done is attack the issue of cost control. And this is where Sen. Wofford and I very much disagree. He believes in global budgets. He supported a bill, the Daschle/Wofford bill, that sets a budget for the country of how much we can spend. I believe that what we need to do is empower the consumer, give you more choices, more responsibility, not less. He takes all that money, in fact he voted for a sixteen-percent payroll tax in the Kennedy bill that he worked on in committee. A sixteen percent tax on every dollar you earn to go to Washington to fund a program to be administered by Washington to set all the choices for you, to dictate all the policies for you. That's not what's in the best interest of this country. What's in the best interest of this country is a government that facilitates--that helps people to help themselves, not a government that dictates and tells you what's best for you.

MH: Don Ernsberger, if you become a senator, what kind of health care if any would you support?

DE: Well, you know, the key to understanding the medical problem in this country is to understand that government has interfered in the supply and demand end of things. In the supply end, the government has dried up

DE: Well, you know, the key to understanding the medical problem in this country is to understand that government has interfered in the supply and demand end of things. In the supply end, the government has dried up the ability of pharmaceutical companies to do the research, of hospitals, of there will be a health-care bill brought up again in the next Congress. And in order of the draw. Mr. Santorum, you're next. Tell us what if anything you would do about a health-care bill in January.

RS: Well I've actually introduced my own health reform bill that address the two major problems that confront this country. Number one, of getting people into the system, and we've provided insurance reform to make sure that everybody who wants insurance can get it, and subsidies to help people who can't afford it to get that insurance. The second thing we've done is attack the issue of cost control. And this is where Sen. Wofford and I very much disagree. He believes in global budgets. He supported a bill, the

You have the Democrats and the Democrats Lite. The Republicans want to drift toward socialist policy. We reject it. Government takeover of health care in this country, I guarantee you, will have the efficiency of the US Post Office, the cost-effectiveness of the Pentagon, and the compassion of the IRS.

HW: Marc, I don't want a govt. TAKEOVER of medicine. I want a govt. that acts to let the American people have the kind of private health insurance choices that members of congress have arranged for themselves. Nothing that Cong. Santorum said about the work I've done is accurate on health care, but let me say that the problem now is not just the roadblock that's been piled up by the congressional Republican leadership, with whom Cong. Santorum goes in lock-step, in gridlock. It is the hypocrisy that is at issue right now, the hypocrisy of those, like Cong. Santorum, who say we will not guarantee health insurance and ask your employer to pay. We are asking OUR employer to pay for our health insurance. I think Cong. Santorum should not stand there blocking health insurance for the American people when he will not arrange for the American people the kind of health insurance that he has guaranteed for himself.

DB: Well, I'm sorry to say it, but our health-care reform bill was dictated, mandated, and manipulated by the PACs and the lobbyists. Mr. Santorum said we needed malpractice reform. Yet the Trial Lawyers Assn. gave \$3.9 million to the health care committees so we wouldn't get malpractice reform. We need cost-containment. We need hospitals and insurers to pay their fair share of the taxes. Right now they're not for profit, and they don't even pay their taxes. We have to bring costs under control for singular users. Not that they just have to belong to a group, but they should get the same rights as a group. Singular users. Until we get PAC-cash influence out of the debate, we will never have true health-care reform.

MH: One aspect of all this that I find confusing and maybe all of you can give your opinions about it this evening, is the business of how much the govt. should do toward controlling costs, and towards seeing to it that

MH: One aspect of all this that I find confusing and maybe all of you can give your opinions about it this evening, is the business of how much the govt. should do toward controlling costs, and towards seeing to it that everybody has coverage. We say that we want to control costs, we want everybody have coverage, but then people say they want to let the free

HW: Marc, I don't want a govt. TAKEOVER of medicine. I want a govt. that acts to let the American people have the kind of private health insurance choices that members of congress have arranged for themselves. Nothing that Cong. Santorum said about the work I've done is accurate on health care, but let me say that the problem now is not just the roadblock that's been piled up by the congressional Republican leadership, with whom Cong. Santorum goes in lock-step, in gridlock. It is the hypocrisy that is at issue right now, the hypocrisy of those, like Cong. Santorum, who say we will not guarantee health insurance and ask your employer to pay. We are asking OUR employer to pay for our health insurance. I think Cong. Santorum should not stand there blocking health insurance for the American people

Government is not the answer. It's the marketplace, and I mean a real marketplace. Not what Republicans and Dems. call the marketplace. (MH: So you wouldn't mandate anything specific . . .) I would break down the walls that have built the monopolies and the cartels in the medical care industry. I would break open the system and liberate it.

MH: Ms Blough, would you regulate if you were a senator?

DB: No. Absolutely not. I think free enterprise works fine except when govt. gets involved. The more govt. intervention, the more it costs, and the less service you get. So no. You want to reduce it to the smallest size.

MH: Mr. Wofford, how much control should the govt. exercise?

HW: Look what Congress has arranged for itself. FEBP, nine million federal employees, including their families, get a choice every year of plans, all kinds of plans, choose-your-own-doctor plans, HMOs, every year they can change. Their employer the taxpayer pays them up to three quarters of their health-insurance premiums. Very small little bureaucracy offers that menu of choices. It's private choice by the consumer in charge. It's simple. It's not so complicated except for those that want to pile up the roadblock and not let the American people get the kind of health insurance that they've established for themselves. (MH: So the govt. would set it up but not run it?) I'm not proposing that that plan would be exactly the mode. I AM proposing that that plan be open to small business and individuals who work for companies that can't, that aren't providing health insurance to buy into it if they choose. It will give low-cost, reasonable choice of doctors, plans, to the American people who are not able to get it through their employer today.

MH: Mr. Santorum, how much regulation, control? . . .

RS: Well, we put together a bipartisan plan. In fact I've worked on several bipartisan plans to try to break the gridlock that has been set up by those who want the govt. to take control of the system. Sen. Wofford is one of

RS: Well, we put together a bipartisan plan. In fact I've worked on several bipartisan plans to try to break the gridlock that has been set up by those who want the govt. to take control of the system. Sen. Wofford is one of those people. Now he'll tell you that he's for private health insurance, but his bill, the Daschle/Wofford bill, is a single-payer, Canadian-style bill, and

MH: Ms Blough, would you regulate if you were a senator?

DB: No. Absolutely not. I think free enterprise works fine except when govt. gets involved. The more govt. intervention, the more it costs, and the less service you get. So no. You want to reduce it to the smallest size.

MH: Mr. Wofford, how much control should the govt. exercise?

HW: Look what Congress has arranged for itself. FEBP, nine million federal employees, including their families, get a choice every year of plans, all kinds of plans, choose-your-own-doctor plans, HMOs, every year they can change. Their employer the taxpayer pays them up to three quarters of their health

quote?

HW: Incorrect statement of the bill, of what Sen. Daschle says, (RS: It's in the Inquirer this MORNING) the Inquirer's . . . It's an incorrect statement EVEN of what the Inquirer said this morning, Marc.

MH: The quotes, you're saying, are wrong. OK. (RS and possibly HW speaking also. RS mentions Daily News)

DB: This is what the people are so angry about. Two politicians lying to each other, lying to each other, to us. Who are we to believe?

MH: One last question on health care (now DB and DE keep talking). Two years ago when HW ran for Senate he said that Americans have a RIGHT to health care. A brief answer down the line. Does everybody have a right, Mr. Wofford, to health care?

HW: We must turn that into a reality, and have a system in which the kind of private health-care choices that Cong. Santorum this very weekend, in our debate in Pittsburgh, said he would not give back to the taxpayers . . . he would not deprive his family of having the benefit of that kind of a plan. That's the kind of plan that, if it's good enough for Congress, it's good enough for the American people. (MH: And we have a right to it?) And the American people are angry at politicians who have the hypocrisy to block health care (RS: Not tell the truth) and block health care for the American people and then insist on keeping a good plan for themselves. (MH: But for the record, we have a RIGHT to it, in your opinion?) My opinion? Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the US means . . . "right" doesn't mean it's free. We pay, we share, it's a shared-contribution system, not a taxpayer system, a premium system like most Americans have today in the private sector. That's what I wanted to extend to the rest of the American people.

DE: I wanted to address this very issue, because as a Libertarian I'm tired of political groups creating brand new rights. Rights are not something the

DE: I wanted to address this very issue, because as a Libertarian I'm tired of political groups creating brand new rights. Rights are not something the collective creates and then forces all individuals to pay the cost for. The

MH: The quotes, you're saying, are wrong. OK. (RS and possibly HW speaking also. RS mentions Daily News)

DB: This is what the people are so angry about. Two politicians lying to each other, lying to each other, to us. Who are we to believe?

MH: One last question on health care (now DB and DE keep talking). Two years ago when HW ran for Senate he said that Americans have a RIGHT to health care. A brief answer down the line. Does everybody have a right, Mr. Wofford, to health care?

they come to this country for is the opportunity. That's what we want to create in health-care reform. We want to create the opportunity. With respect to the Senator about not giving up my health care. Senator, when I attack an issue, I attack it not to give up my own health care or give up my own bank account at the House bank, I closed the House bank. I went out and did fundamental reform. I changed the system, not play gimmicks about taking or not taking my health insurance. (MH: Is health care a right?) I said you have a right to the opportunity to get health insurance.

HW: Marc, it's a right to sleep under the bridge. It's a right, in his plan, it's a right to save and have three-thousand-dollar deductibles if you can afford it. And Marc, it seems to me that the Congressman who says that he is going to insist on having those benefits, is not getting in boat with the American people. And I've had one after another of my senators come up and say, "But if we don't have health insurance, . . . we have pre-existing conditions and we couldn't get any health insurance."

RS: Senator, in your account, you have a right to a staff, you have a right to transportation expense, all these things that the taxpayers pay for. They pay your salary. They pay for your transportation. They pay for a lot of things. Does that mean that we have to give that to every single American: because a member of Congress gets paid \$122,000 a year, that means, (DB: Listen to them arguing again.) that every member of the public has to get paid that same amount? It's a matter of creating an opportunity in society, Senator, not dictating everything from Washington.

MH: Ms Blough, is it a right? Is health care . . .

DB: It's a right if you can afford it, and if we can afford it we can get it. Yes. The problem with health care is the cost. We cannot afford it. (MH: So it's not a right?) There are absolutely fraudulent billing practices. We all know that. We all know somebody that has been fraudulently billed. We know the bloated costs. And yet no one here has addressed that yet.

know that. We all know somebody that has been fraudulently billed. We know the bloated costs. And yet no one here has addressed that yet.

HW: Marc, the goal of a right to health insurance for all Americans . . . is the goal. My stick of dynamite in the bill to take away a good health plan taking or not taking my health insurance. (MH: Is health care a right?) I said you have a right to the opportunity to get health insurance.

HW: Marc, it's a right to sleep under the bridge. It's a right, in his plan, it's a right to save and have three-thousand-dollar deductibles if you can afford it. And Marc, it seems to me that the Congressman who says that he is going to insist on having those benefits, is not getting in boat with the American people. And I've had one after another of my senators come up and say, "But if we don't have health insurance, . . . we have pre-existing conditions and we couldn't get any health insurance."

RS: Senator, in your account, you have a right to a staff, you have a right

should not be giving Senators and Congressmen that kind of luxurious perks.

MH: Next subject, Crime. The Congress of the US passed a large crime bill a couple of months ago. It includes prevention. It includes punishment. It includes some new jails and police officers. It includes some opportunities for young people to play basketball at night instead of go out and steal cars. It's an omnibus crime bill. Some people think it has too much punishment and not enough prevention. Some people think the other way around. Let's talk about crime. Was the crime bill a good one, and what else would you do about it if you became a senator?

DE: The recent crime bill is a very clear example of the Republican AND the Democratic parties on this issue. You see, what this bill really was was a combination of the demands of the Republicans merged with the demands of the Democrats. The Republicans wanted more jails, more polices. The Democrats wanted more social programs for urban Democratic mayors to hand out money, and of course some feel-good gun legislation. When I give my students an assignment to try to find a solution, I tell them that the first thing you need to do is to analyze the cause. And the fact is that the cause of the crime explosion in this country has been the government's war on drugs. This govt. has created the most expensive substance on earth: illegal drugs. We have doubled our jail space: 53% of federal criminals are there because of drug-law violations. We have drive-by shootings. We have jails packed to the top of the roofs. We have courts that are clogged. We have police that are corrupted, all because we have a govt. that thinks that drug use should be a legal problem when in fact it's a medical problem. (MH: You think that drugs should be legalized?) I think they should be decriminalized and dealt with as a medical issue and not as a law issue.

HW: Marc, I'm not satisfied with the progress that we've made on any front entirely, but one of the best steps forward has been this crime bill. It's the toughest bill in American history. It adds death penalties. It adds tough stiffening of truth-in-sentencing. It above all is going to get 100,000 police on the streets in community policing. I've seen that work all over PA. I was leading the charge to add to those community police because of what I've seen from police and neighborhoods working together. And I think it's a defining issue in this campaign that we got that bill through. It was a cliffhanger. We got it through because the red, white, and blue spirit, in which Republicans and Democrats worked together for the common good. Moderate Republicans, like Sen. Specter came across the line and helped us do it. Congressman Santorum tried to push that bill off the cliff, and that's not what the spirit of PA is. We should come together in the war on crime, and this bill was a good first step.

MH: Ms Blough, your opinion of the crime bill and your opinion of prevention and punishment?

DB: I think we love war: war on crime; war on drugs. I don't think the federal government has anything to do with local crime. If the federal govt. could fix crime, then why doesn't it clean up Washington DC where crime is the number one? Highest in the nation. They can't fix it in their own back yard. What do we need? Most crimes are committed by juveniles who are unsupervised, unchallenged, and uneducated. Our education system has failed our children. Number two, our economic recession that we're in (which we are still in, though the Democratic administration doesn't seem to believe) stops people from hiring people--business people cannot create jobs--leaving young people on the street. Hanging on the corners. Doing nothing. Using drugs, you're right. Illegal drugs, economic recessions, is what causes crime.

RS: The issue is a very complicated one, and there's two things that a US senator can do with respect to the issue of crime. Number one, they can confirm judges that will enforce the law. The senator always talks about Sen. Specter. Sen. Specter voted against Judge Barkett, who you voted for, Senator. Judge Barkett is known throughout this country as one of the most liberal judges in letting criminals out of jail and not enforcing the law. We have an instance where you have a person who shot and killed three people at a supermarket on a shooting spree. Two police come up to accost them, and he shoots both of them dead. She believes that he shouldn't get the death penalty because he was justifiably afraid that the police would harm him. You voted to confirm that judge, Senator, and I could go on with case after case after case of this judge and other judges. We need someone who's not just going to talk tough on crime, but vote for judges who will be tough on crime, because they're the ones who enforce the law. I've been endorsed by every single police organization in this state who has endorsed a candidate for the US Senate. And that's because I support very tough legal measures that go after the real problem, which is, which are criminals and, and people who are repeat, repeat violent offenders.

a candidate for the US Senate. And that's because I support very tough legal measures that go after the real problem, which is, which are criminals and, and people who are repeat, repeat violent offenders.

MH: Mr. Wofford, you shook your head on the question of the judge that the number one? Highest in the nation. They can't fix it in their own back yard. What do we need? Most crimes are committed by juveniles who are unsupervised, unchallenged, and uneducated. Our education system has failed our children. Number two, our economic recession that we're in (which we are still in, though the Democratic administration doesn't seem to believe) stops people from hiring people--business people cannot create jobs--leaving young people on the street. Hanging on the corners. Doing nothing. Using drugs, you're right. Illegal drugs, economic recessions, is what causes crime.

RS: The issue is a very complicated one, and there's two things that a US senator can do with respect to the issue of crime. Number one, they can

crime bill. The crime bill is vital to the war on crime, and every police officer in the front line on crime that I've met with around PA has wanted those resources for more prisons, more preventive action, and above all, more community police.

MH: One of the questions that came up during this crime-bill debate, and the mayor of Phila took a strong position, was that more money should, in his opinion, more money should be spent for prevention. And people made jokes and called it midnight basketball. But Ms Blough, what do you think about that, the idea of trying to occupy young people so that they're not out on the streets at night.

DB: No. I don't agree with that at all. I'm sorry. They should be educated. They should be getting a job. We should create economic conditions that they could work, that they could be proud of themselves through their accomplishments. Not that we gave them another social welfare program. No no no. Crime is a local issue. Our schools, our educators, and our parents have to get involved in the crime of the . . . (MH: Mr. Ernsberger, do you think the federal govt. . . .)

DE: The best prevention is to find out what was the cause of the problem. Politicians are always the last to get the point. Leading scholars in this country, from right to left in the political spectrum, the new head of the ABA, mayors of cities, judges, but never politicians are willing to tell you the truth about crime. The explosion is because of the government's just crazy war on drugs. The fact is that crime is a local issue, and we wouldn't have the explosion if this country didn't have this war against narcotics. (MH: Midnight basketball, any remaining thoughts?)

HW: You do know whose crusade midnight basketball was? It was President George Bush. That's where I first heard about it, and it was replayed on Nightline just the other night. He believes that basketball, structured well, is one of the ways that you challenge and occupy young people. But nothing in this bill requires any community to use its preventive resources--Police Athletic League, or any . . . for midnight basketball. If they replayed on Nightline just the other night. He believes that basketball, structured well, is one of the ways that you challenge and occupy young people. But nothing in this bill requires any community to use its preventive resources--Police Athletic League, or any . . . for midnight basketball. If they want to use basketball as one of the ways to get people off the streets, they can do it. But it's up to the communities. This is a bill that gives some resources to communities. It doesn't try to have the federal govt. take over. It lets the kind of partnership between police and neighborhoods that is going on in PA get some more resources.

RS: It just goes to show that I'm bipartisan when it comes to opposing pork-barrel spending, whether President Bush or President Clinton proposes it. I oppose it. We have, existing today, \$3 billion--prior to this crime bill we

are spending \$3 billion a year on 266 existing "prevention programs." If prevention programs solved the crime problem we'd be the safest country in the world, and we're not.

MH: Let's talk about campaign finance reform now. Virtually every politician in America has, in the last couple of years, spoken out against the way we finance campaigns. All good public-service groups speak out against the system. And some of the critical points are the so-called PACs, the political action committees, which raise tens of millions of dollars, which are given indirectly to candidates. Sometimes they're given just to the party. Sometimes they run their own ads, but in effect they're giving political money. There's also the question of public funding which has come up. And there's a third point about individuals who spend their own money--and after all if it's your money, how much of it, or should there be a limit on how much you can spend. Well, broad question, but what do you think about campaign-finance reform?

HW: Well, I think it's a tragedy that even the relatively small first step that had been finally agreed to by overwhelming bipartisan support in both house fell victim to the gridlock policy of not letting anything pass in these last three months that would help the other party, help Pres. Clinton, help someone else. I think that's what people hate about Washington, hate about politics, and it happened to campaign finance reform. The thing I'm going to fight for in the next session of Congress is what we have here tonight. Don and Diane have a chance because there's free television. What Rick and I spend so much time and money trying to get is time on television. The way you cut through most of that is get time free on television, limit the expenses in other respects, do what you're doing tonight, do it enough so that people can make up their minds, and you basically solve the problem. (MH: In this case I should add that this television station offered this time. Would you mandate that every television station in this country give time?) A certain amount of time. I would. Yes I would. Not paid by the govt., just a contribution they make for the license they have to make profits on the public airs. And it's the kind of public service that I salute you for doing.

A certain amount of time. I would. Yes I would. Not paid by the govt., just a contribution they make for the license they have to make profits on the public airs. And it's the kind of public service that I salute you for doing.

DB: I think it's the most insidious evil. And the one thing that people are way we finance campaigns. All good public-service groups speak out against the system. And some of the critical points are the so-called PACs, the political action committees, which raise tens of millions of dollars, which are given indirectly to candidates. Sometimes they're given just to the party. Sometimes they run their own ads, but in effect they're giving political money. There's also the question of public funding which has come up. And there's a third point about individuals who spend their own money--and after all if it's your money, how much of it, or should there be a limit on how much you can spend. Well, broad question, but what do you think about campaign-finance reform?

HW: Well, I think it's a tragedy that even the relatively small first step that

who . . . they can't discipline themselves to stop taking the money. (MH: To be specific, would you stop those groups from giving money to campaigns?) Absolutely (MH: You'd allow no contributions from anybody, or what?) During their campaign, a maximum of \$500. But during legislation, not when bills are being written. And get lobbyists off the floor of the Congress.

RS: Here's another clear difference between Sen. Wofford and myself. Sen. Wofford supports public funding of campaigns and mandates on businesses (HW: Not correct.) to . . . to . . . to, uh, air time while they're trying to make a business. That's typical. That, you know, someone else's job to do this. I believe it's the people's job to support and fund campaigns. And I've introduced legislation and supported it, to make sure that the majority, in fact, we have introduced legislation that says that almost all of your funds have to come from individuals within your district, if you're a congressman, or within your state. 98% of contributions I receive, uh, I receive from individuals come from within PA. I would very happily compare that with all of the out-of-state money that Sen. Wofford gets from all over the country to support this campaign, being raised by Bill Clinton and Al Gore. What we've done is try to run a grass-roots, people-oriented campaign that focuses in on volunteers and that focuses in on people-involvement. That's why you see our bumper stickers and our yard signs all over the place, because we believe that you run campaigns best by being out there, as I have, in every county of the state. And Sen. Wofford, in the first three years of office, didn't visit almost a third of the counties in the state of PA (HW: Absolutely untrue. Absolutely untrue.) in the first three years of office. And that's just a

MH: How many counties did you visit?

HW: I visited every county in PA. And when he was saying I didn't I actually went by two of the counties and said I hadn't and the people told me about our meetings and what it was like.

DE: You know, I'd like to listen carefully to words. Harris just said two words. He said "bipartisan" campaign reform, and he said, "contribution by me about our meetings and what it was like."

DE: You know, I'd like to listen carefully to words. Harris just said two words. He said "bipartisan" campaign reform, and he said, "contribution by me about our meetings and what it was like."

DE: You know, I'd like to listen carefully to words. Harris just said two words. He said "bipartisan" campaign reform, and he said, "contribution by TV stations." Now listen to what we're really saying here. A contribution is not when the government holds a gun to the point of the head of a television station and says, "You'll do it or else." That's not the concept of contribution. And "bipartisan" is very accurate, because you know what happens when you have campaign reform? the reason we have PACs today is because PACs were designed by the campaign reformers of 1970s. They are ways that people get around the law. We have bipartisan campaign reform that deliberately leaves out independents like myself. For example, the voters should know that each of the gentlemen to my right and left had

to go out and get 2,000 petition names in order to be on the ballot. I had to get 23,000 names to be on the ballot. Each of their parties received \$10 million from the tax (Missing end of quote - not on tape) and stop having a government that gives away all the special privileges that PACs go after.

MH: So, just to make it real simple, if I could get a one word answer, would you eliminate PACs and would you limit the amount of money that can be given by PACs?

DB: Limit the money.

RS: I would limit amount PACs can contribute, I wouldn't eliminate them, I think that's unconstitutional.

MH: Would you limit the amounts given to candidates, because it's limited now?

RS: I would limit it actually more than it is limited now.

DE: Would eliminate PACs.

LOWV: Well, I voted for and against Congress. Eliminate the amount that taxes can contribute. Congressman Santorum holds his own, to put it mildly, in getting money from PAC contributions, but, right now, his chances of getting PAC contributions from the television stations and networks has gone up considerably. And, Don, I'm willing to join you, for a while let's not require it, let's ask. You know, John Kennedy turned that word into a strong verb, let's ask TV stations to do what your doing today and let's ask the LOWV to take the lead and I am glad that they asked and I pressed for having the Patriots and the Libertarians here tonight.

DE: Lets use the correct words. A contribution is not government forced, they're totally opposite.

DE: Lets use the correct words. A contribution is not government forced, they're totally opposite.

MH: Term limits is another element in campaign reform that's getting a lot of play and everywhere its been on the ballot and correct me if I am wrong it would you eliminate PACs and would you limit the amount of money that can be given by PACs?

DB: Limit the money.

RS: I would limit amount PACs can contribute, I wouldn't eliminate them, I think that's unconstitutional.

MH: Would you limit the amounts given to candidates, because it's limited now?

RS: I would limit it actually more than it is limited now.

who is the biggest treasurer and the biggest fund raiser was our vice presidential candidate in 1980 the libertarian party has been way ahead of other parties in making basic changes in term limits line item veto and a balanced budget.

MH: So you're all for it?

DE: Absolutely.

MH: Mr. Santorum?

RS: I am 100% in support of term limits and have been during my tenure both before I was in congress I support a 12 year limitation of terms I have signed on to bills signed on to discharge petitions to bring this issue forward because the people have a right to get a vote on it.

MH: Mr. Wofford?

HW: Unlike other ways where he doesn't practice what he preaches I am helping congressman Santorum limit his terms in the house of representatives which he wont be going back to I voted for term limits I support term limits I initiated the first term limits in government with the five year rule in the peace corps that no one in the staff of the the peace corps could serve from janitor to director to associate director could serve more than five years the five year flush, in, up, and out its given new blood to the peace corps its a good idea I am for it.

MH: Ms Blough, term limits?

DB: Absolutely, but unfortunately it is like the necessary evil that we have to stop because we have created career politicians who now get million dollar pensions and if we let them go on and on we will go bankrupt. Pat Shroder has \$4.2 million in her pension fund for 20 some years service. Who of us in private industry would have \$4 million in our pension fund if we don't limit the careers because they won't limit themselves Mr. Shroder has \$4.2 million in her pension fund for 20 some years service. Who of us in private industry would have \$4 million in our pension fund if we don't limit the careers because they won't limit themselves Mr. Michael is leaving with \$8600 dollars a month pension because he served

DE: Absolutely.

MH: Mr. Santorum?

RS: I am 100% in support of term limits and have been during my tenure both before I was in congress I support a 12 year limitation of terms I have signed on to bills signed on to discharge petitions to bring this issue forward because the people have a right to get a vote on it.

MH: Mr. Wofford?

what would you do limit the amount of time as the president suggested day care what?

DB: No cut the waste the fraud and all that we spend we spend \$318 billion a year on welfare yet if I gave a check for \$1400 to every family on welfare it would only cost \$100 billion 2/3 of it goes to administration we have 42 different agencies administrating welfare with 158 work programs and 42 different places where you can get either free food stamps, health care or whatever.

MH: Rick Santorum 30 seconds on welfare reform

RS: Okay I wrote the most supported welfare reform bill in the house of representatives I have 170 cosponsors of the bill in fact the secretary of health and human services who I am not always in agreement with came and actually praised our bill in the ways and means committee. It puts a time limit on welfare it goes after that waste and abuse particularly in that area in area of SSI with drug addicts and alcoholics and putting a limit on that it goes after the real serious problem with children being born out of wedlock in this country at a rate at a rate of 30% by bringing father back into the situation by requiring paternity establishment by the states to do a better job of bringing fathers back in to the family that is something where I have taken the lead in the house of representatives and done it in a bipartisan fashion put forth a centrist bill that has support from both the left and the right and I think it shows you the kind of work that we can do when given the opportunity.

MH: Mr. Ernsberger, reform welfare in 30 seconds

DE: Well lets face it welfare in this society locks individuals in poverty it erodes the family and it destroys the very values that are important to bring your self out of poverty. As I campaign around this commonwealth I meet people who are poorly trained, poorly educated who are told by their social welfare workers that if you get a low paying job where going to throw you off the public welfare rolls. what we need is to turn the system around we need to use negative income tax tax approach which gives subsidies to low income people. we have 42 different agencies administrating welfare with 158 work programs and 42 different places where you can get either free food stamps, health care or whatever.

MH: Rick Santorum 30 seconds on welfare reform

RS: Okay I wrote the most supported welfare reform bill in the house of representatives I have 170 cosponsors of the bill in fact the secretary of health and human services who I am not always in agreement with came and actually praised our bill in the ways and means committee. It puts a time limit on welfare it goes after that waste and abuse particularly in that area in area of SSI with drug addicts and alcoholics and putting a limit on that it

only one here that has spent 3 or 4 years working on getting people from welfare to work when I was secretary of labor and industry with John White as secretary of welfare and Bob Casey strong support we did it and we found two things that you needed the kind of tax credit that we just had gotten through with no help from congressman Santorum who voted against it but we also need to make sure that when people move from welfare to work where talking about women with dependent children that they don't lose health care benefits when they take a job they need health care with the job otherwise it is crazy to take people now on welfare who have health care benefits into the work force to pay taxes for people on welfare it is an invitation to stay on welfare.

RS: If I could just make a commit on voting against your income tax credit I have been a strong supporter of that program the reason I voted against the earned income tax credit and certainly the senator knows this is that it was part of the Clinton tax increase I was not going to vote for \$250 billion worth of taxes to get a earned income tax credit he voted for the largest tax increase in American history.

HW: This is really very important just a quick commit that five year deficit reduction plan I am proud to have voted for it was a tough vote it did raise taxes on the top 1.2% of the people people with more than \$140,000 of income and is working the deficit for the third year in a row is going down jobs are going up the economy is growing and let me make a deal with congressman Santorum if you look out for the top 1% of the people I will go back to Washington to fight for the rest of us.

MH: Let me throw out a softball to the two independent candidates - raising taxes?

DB: No, President Clinton's bill is showing a reduction in the deficit because we've raised taxes and have collected more revenue in fact. However, when we start the new spending bills that are also attached to that, we will see the deficit rise again.

Because we've raised taxes and have collected more revenue.
However, when we start the new spending bills that are also attached to that, we will see the deficit rise again.

DE: Yeah, the Libertarian Party is the anti-tax party in the country, but you work where talking about women with dependent children that they don't lose health care benefits when they take a job they need health care with the job otherwise it is crazy to take people now on welfare who have health care benefits into the work force to pay taxes for people on welfare it is an invitation to stay on welfare.

RS: If I could just make a commit on voting against your income tax credit I have been a strong supporter of that program the reason I voted against the earned income tax credit and certainly the senator knows this is that it was part of the Clinton tax increase I was not going to vote for \$250 billion worth of taxes to get a earned income tax credit he voted for the largest tax increase in American history.

and people just don't buy it. Eliminate this, eliminate this, and abolish. You can't abolish agencies. You can reform them, and you can cut back. But you cannot abolish. (DE: We need to abolish.) You cannot abolish them, sir.

RS: I'd like to comment on Sen. Wofford saying that he took care of the 99%. How about the 99% who pay for home heating oil that you increased the taxes on home heating oil in that bill? How about the people that drive in this country, where you increased the gas tax by five percent? How about the BTU tax you voted for? How about, how about the diesel fuel tax on farm machinery? How about the barge tax, which would simply shut down a lot of the inland waterways and completely silence the rivers in this country that YOU voted for? (HW trying to cut in) Those are middle-class taxes, Senator.

MH: [to HW] Those were in the bill, right?

HW: Some in one bill, some in others, and some not accurately stated at all. The point of that hard deficit-reduction plan is that to govern is to choose, and when we had a chance for the first time to move against the deficit and to bring it down, now in three years by one third, Congressman Santorum, when he had a chance, didn't do it.

MH: OK, enough said on THAT subject. Let's talk about federal mandates. That's a broad term that generally describes things that the federal govt. says the states, the cities, the counties must do, and some people think the fed. govt. should pay for them. For example, Phila has been told to put curb cuts for wheelchairs on every corner--very expensive--many of the counties in PA are going to be having special inspection stations for automobiles to clean up the air, which the fed. govt. says they have to do, but the state and the counties will have to pay. So the question is, if the fed. govt. mandates that the states and the counties have to do something, should the fed. govt. pay for it?

RS: The answer is absolutely yes. In fact, I have sponsored bills that would eliminate any more unfunded mandates being passed on, not only to fed. govt. pay for it, fed. govt. pay for it?

RS: The answer is absolutely yes. In fact, I have sponsored bills that would eliminate any more unfunded mandates being passed on, not only to fed. govt. pay for it, fed. govt. pay for it.

RS: The answer is absolutely yes. In fact, I have sponsored bills that would eliminate any more unfunded mandates being passed on, not only to local governments such as the city of Phila, but to ALL business as well. We have to recognize that what we see in govt. these days is a . . . is a . . . is a bankrupt machine that can no longer do the things that they want to do, these big-government ideas to force people to do things by paying for them. So what they're going to do is now just pass them on to someone else to pay for. I don't support that, and there's another clear difference. One other comment. Social security tax was also in there, not on high-income people, but on people earning \$33,000 a year.

DE: Well, I am absolutely opposed to any government unfunded mandates, but I go further than that. There are plenty of programs in this country that are fully funded that we should not be doing. You see, this problem of abolition is not a radical suggestion. It's basically saying that we're tired of the idea that once a program is passed, the whole debate needs to be, "Should we trim it by five percent, or should we expand it by five percent?" Unfunded mandates, many funded mandates, and a lot of the fed. govt. should be reduced in size, and that includes abolition of wasteful agencies that shouldn't exist in the first place.

MH: Mr. Wofford, specifically focus, if you would, on things like curb cuts for Phila and the clean-air business.

HW: Marc, I supported--voted for--an end to unfunded mandates, and we had a bill ready to go that would deal with that. We had a campaign-finance bill ready to go. We had a vital bill for PA, the trash bill, that would have untied the governor's hands and let us deal with the flood of garbage coming into our state. We had bipartisan support for a half dozen important bills, and we've had a killing field, in which the partisanship of the congressional Republican leadership, designed clearly to take us back to the failed policies of Bush and Reagan which landed this commonwealth and this country in, . . . landed us on our backs. . . . which had . . . I picked up the wreckage of those policies: the jobs that were lost; the homes that were broken; the factories closed. PA got hit as hard as anyplace in this country. And I'm going to do everything I can to stop this strategy of obstruction and partisanship for the purpose of taking us back to the failed policies of the 80s.

MH: Ms Blough, what do you think about mandates? Federal government says you've gotta cut the curbs, doesn't pay the money for it. Should they?

DB: Absolutely. Absolutely. But whose money is it? It's our money. It's in our pocket. It's down here at the state. We send it up to them, and then they buy our votes to give us our money back. I mean it's our money. People down here in this state, when you . . . and over regulations, I mean our pocket. It's down here at the state. We send it up to them, and then they buy our votes to give us our money back. I mean it's our money. People down here in this state, when you . . . and over regulations, I mean govt. regulations are crippling our economy. They are closing business. EPA regulations have closed billions of dollars of industry. They over regulate. should be reduced in size, and that includes abolition of wasteful agencies that shouldn't exist in the first place.

MH: Mr. Wofford, specifically focus, if you would, on things like curb cuts for Phila and the clean-air business.

HW: Marc, I supported--voted for--an end to unfunded mandates, and we had a bill ready to go that would deal with that. We had a campaign-finance bill ready to go. We had a vital bill for PA, the trash bill, that would have untied the governor's hands and let us deal with the flood of garbage coming into our state. We had bipartisan support for a half dozen important bills, and

Ernsberger. Should there be cameras allowed in the federal courtrooms, as the reporters are allowed to bring in their notebooks?

DE: I would absolutely prohibit cameras in the courtrooms. The reason is that what we've seen in this country just recently with some of these spectacular trials, the purpose of justice is to seek objectivity, not television ratings. The purpose of justice is to seek truth, not to make a spectacle of the process. I would kick the cameras out.

HW: I agree with Don. Much as I respect the media when it does something like this, I don't think either politicians or the media should be in the court of justice, where you want people not to be playing to the ratings and to the audience, but to think about what is just in this case. (MH: Might you also then take the camera out of the Senate and out of the House?) No, they are photographing politicians at work. And I think the people of this country ought to see politicians at work, and see politicians like Congressman Santorum who talk against a pay raise and then take it.

DB: (MH: Cameras in the courtroom?) No. I disagree with that. And C-Span's one of my favorite stations to watch. However, I do feel, though, that politicians are on camera. (MH: But in the courtrooms, no?) No.

RS: My feeling is that the Judiciary is a separate and equal branch of the government and should make its decision as to whether there should be cameras there on its own. It doesn't need the Congress to make a determination for them as to whether that's the best thing for the Judiciary. They're an equal branch. They should make that decision. (MH: Do you have an opinion?) No. I believe it's up to them. I mean, I have opinions on a lot of things that I have no opportunity to do. My vote would be to allow them to make the decision themselves. (MH: Would you like to see them let cameras in?) I guess the answer is, probably not, but I don't think . . .

MH: Time now for closing statements. One minute from each of the candidates.

MH: Time now for closing statements. ~~the voters need to understand~~ the voters need to understand candidates.

DE: As we give our closing presentations, the voters need to understand ratings. The purpose of justice is to seek truth, not to make a spectacle of the process. I would kick the cameras out.

HW: I agree with Don. Much as I respect the media when it does something like this, I don't think either politicians or the media should be in the court of justice, where you want people not to be playing to the ratings and to the audience, but to think about what is just in this case. (MH: Might you also then take the camera out of the Senate and out of the House?) No, they are photographing politicians at work. And I think the people of this country ought to see politicians at work, and see politicians like Congressman Santorum who talk against a pay raise and then take it.

recent decision of the Patriot Party to ally itself with Leonora Fallani of the New Alliance Party, a party that believes in socialist and welfare-state ideas that would make HW look like a conservative, makes it clear to me that the Libertarian Party is the only party to choose. Between now and election day the Santorums and the Woffords will spend millions of dollars to get your vote. Join the Libertarian party in creating new alternatives. Remember, if you keep on voting the way you've been voting, you're going to keep on receiving exactly what you've been receiving.

HW: The choice in this election is whether we go forward in the spirit of PA patriotism to bring people together and be practical, or get dragged back by the gridlock gang that Cong. Santorum is a part of, that wants to take us to the very policies that took our debt from one trillion to four trillion, took us to the worst recession that we've had and laid PA on its back. I want to stop that, and I don't want to do anything I can do to let a congressman who has joined that gang, who talks against the pay raise, takes it, who votes against unemployment compensation benefits at the height of the recession, against Family and Medical Leave, against National Service, against the very measures that . . . that . . . against the crime bill. I want us to learn to say yes in this country, and to build. There's a time to tear down, and the Republican congressional leadership that Cong. Santorum is lock-step with is trying to tear down. It's a time for us to build.

RS: Well, with response to the Senator, Senator, you know that I voted against unemployment comp and flood relief because they were not funded programs. They added directly onto the deficit, and I made a pledge, and I have to look at my two little children and say, "I'm no longer going to just fund programs for today and make you pay for them tomorrow," like you do repeatedly. We do need to move forward. To the nineties. Not to the 1960s, where HW and his solutions of more and more taxes, more and more spending, more and more govt. control of your lives and less and less freedom for you, are rooted deeply in. I believe we need new solutions, solutions that empower the individual to help themselves, that give you the responsibility to do it. And it's not NO government. Government has a role to play. Bu the role is to help you help yourself, not to dictate to you what's ~~responsibility to do it. And it's not NO government. Government has a role to play. Bu the role is to help you help yourself, not to dictate to you what's best for you. We also need someone who's going to fight for PA, someone~~ solutions that empower the individual to help themselves, that give you the responsibility to do it. And it's not NO government. Government has a role to play. Bu the role is to help you help yourself, not to dictate to you what's best for you. We also need someone who's going to fight for PA, someone ~~you keep on voting the way you've been voting, you're going to keep on receiving exactly what you've been receiving.~~

HW: The choice in this election is whether we go forward in the spirit of PA patriotism to bring people together and be practical, or get dragged back by the gridlock gang that Cong. Santorum is a part of, that wants to take us to the very policies that took our debt from one trillion to four trillion, took us to the worst recession that we've had and laid PA on its back. I want to stop that, and I don't want to do anything I can do to let a congressman who has joined that gang, who talks against the pay raise, takes it, who votes against unemployment compensation benefits at the height of the recession, against Family and Medical Leave, against National Service,

Did they not do it? Did they vote for it? Did they not do it? That is why the Patriot Party was formed, in the reality that this is what will go on forever. Back in '90 we asked for changes. We asked for term limits, line-item veto, balanced-budget amendment. We asked for a reduction of deficits. In '92 they promised it to us. In '94 we're demanding it. We haven't gotten any of it. Wrote many bills. Passed many amendments. None of it gets through. We need someone who will go there and represent the people and not the special -interest groups, someone who believes in term limits, that doesn't want to make a career out of politics. Someone that wants to go home, back to their business. We have to send someone there that will not take PAC money, so that they will refuse to write legislation written for the special interest groups.

THANK YOUs.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

special -interest groups, someone who believes in term limits, that doesn't want to make a career out of politics. Someone that wants to go home, back to their business. We have to send someone there that will not take PAC money, so that they will refuse to write legislation written for the special interest groups.

THANK YOUs.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 10/31/94
Re: Press Conference on Social Security, WILK Pittston
Media: WYOU Channel 22, WNEP Channel 16,
Times-Leader(Shurmaitis), Inquirer(Larry Fish)

Comments:

The first half of the press conference centered on the social security eligibility age and HW's ad. The second half was only between Shurmaitis and RS - the TV cameras did not tape.

RS on Social Security:

RS: In fact, ah, I'm gonna make sure that social security is there for every generation, I'm going to make sure that the people who are on social security now and who are gonna retire any time in the near future get their social security benefits on time, when it's been promised to them. What I was talking about, and Senator Wofford knows it, was I was talking about when people who are going to be retired after the social security trust fund is already admitted they're going to be bankrupt, and that's thirty years from now. If that's going to be bankrupt then, President Clinton just published a memo about it...I was talking to a twenty-year-old college student from La Salle, and I said 'We have to do something for her generation, so she can plan, just like they did in the late 70s so I could plan.' And what I, what I proposed was that one of the, we had three options - raise taxes, cut benefits, or push back the retirement age. Not from 65 to 70, but from 67, which is what it's going to be...to maybe 69 or 70. And what I suggested was, that that's the fair thing to do for her, their generation's going to be living longer, and so, it makes some sense, as opposed to taxing or cutting benefits, or taxing people more money to put more money in the trust fund. That is a common sense solution. Look, what Harris Wofford is doing is trying to scare people the week before an election to win an election. What I'm trying to do is provide solutions to problems for the next generation to put more money in the trust fund. That is a common sense solution. Look, what Harris Wofford is doing is trying to scare people the week before an election to win an election. What I'm trying to do is provide solutions to problems for the next generation.

Media: Negative Campaigning, WNEP Channel 16,
Times-Leader(Shurmaitis), Inquirer(Larry Fish)

Comments:

The first half of the press conference centered on the social security eligibility age and HW's ad. The second half was only between Shurmaitis and RS - the TV cameras did not tape.

RS on Social Security:

RS: In fact, ah, I'm gonna make sure that social security is there for every generation, I'm going to make sure that the people who are on social security now and who are gonna retire any time in the near future get their social security benefits on

been attacking me from day one...through that entire time, we've run positive ad after positive ad after positive ad. Occasionally we've responded to some of the inaccuracies that he's put on television, but we've talked about our vision for the future, and I think that's why we're winning this race, I think that's why we're going to win this race, because I think people are tired of candidates who don't tell them any of their answers to the problems of, for the future of this country, who just try to tear down their opponent and and and, ah, and win elections by, by ripping their opponent - that isn't what the people want, they're sick of it....You know, I really expected more of Harris Wofford. What he did was a despicable act that was beneath him as a United States Senator, I think he should pull the ad off TV and stop this ridic, these ridiculous statements.

RS Responses to Shurmaitis:

RS on Specific Senior Legislation Sponsored:

RS: Well, I'd have to get you a list. I don't, I, I mean, you're asking, you're, well

DS: Tell us. This is supposed to be about senior citizens, tell us what you've done.

RS: Well, I think if you look at what I've done, first let me tell you what I haven't done. Number one, I haven't taxed social security benefits, Harris Wofford has. Harris Wofford voted not only to tax social security benefits, but take the money that he, from the tax he imposed, and take it, not, not, excuse me, put it not in the Social Security trust fund, but put it in the general fund. The first time in history that we've had a tax on social security benefits that wasn't put into the social security trust fund. This money is now being funneled into the general fund, being taken away from social security recipients and not put back into their fund where it belongs. That's wrong. I have not, you know -

DS: What have you done, though?

RS: You'd know that as well as I think it's just as important what

DS: What have you done, though?

RS: Hold on. Let me just - I think it's just as important what

DS: What have you done, though?

RS: Hold on. Let me just - I think it's just as important what he hasn't done, and what he's done....I've supported funding for long term care by changing it from a prospective payment sys, from a reimbursement system to a prospective payment system. What we have right now is long term care, is a morass of red tape and regulations and billing procedures, that drive up the cost of long term care, and make it very expensive -

DS: Did you introduce a bill?

RS: Yes I did, with Congressman Bill Brewster, was an amendment to the, ah, to the health reform bill that actually came up in

DS: So this was in your Health Care

RS: Right. Well, it's not in my health care bill, it's an amendment that we offered to the health care bill. Was something that Congressman Brewster and I worked on. But we worked to try to change it from a prospective payment system, which would guarantee funding for these nursing home facilities, make it less expensive for the government, believe it or not, because it eliminates all the red tape, and provide more accessibility of certainty for seniors to get long term care. I've introduced legislation to make long-term care insurance tax deductible. Any expenditure on premiums, so if you want to buy long-term care insurance you can have it fully deductible, just like your normal insurance....The other thing we've worked on is the idea of medical savings accounts for seniors. One of the things I hear over and over again is the idea of 'what are we going to do about prescription drugs?' One of the problems is, we have insurance plans that don't cover prescription drugs, and so what we've suggested is this concept of medical savings accounts which gives you tax-free dollars, to be able to go out and afford prescription drugs.

DS: What's your position on Notch babies?

RS: I've always been a supporter of the Notch legislation.

DS: What about Theresa Heinz' comments last week? They were pretty brutal, in their assessment of you.

RS: Well, I guess the response I've given is simply she's entitled to her opinion, and she's one voter and I'm going to have to go out and get another vote or two to offset it, that's all.

DS: She said you were short on public service. Can you rebut that?

RS: I don't, you know, there are a lot of people say a lot of things about me and I don't, I don't, I don't think it's my job to go around rebutting everybody's comments about me. My job is to try to tell the voters what I've done, what I will do...I

RS: I don't, you know, there are a lot of people say a lot of things about me and I don't, I don't, I don't think it's my job to go around rebutting everybody's comments about me. My job is to try to tell the voters what I've done, what I will do...I mean, I know that her husband was a very strong supporter of mine ~~expensive for the government, believe it or not, because it~~ eliminates all the red tape, and provide more accessibility of certainty for seniors to get long term care. I've introduced legislation to make long-term care insurance tax deductible. Any expenditure on premiums, so if you want to buy long-term care insurance you can have it fully deductible, just like your normal insurance....The other thing we've worked on is the idea of medical savings accounts for seniors. One of the things I hear over and over again is the idea of 'what are we going to do about prescription drugs?' One of the problems is, we have insurance plans that don't cover prescription drugs, and so what we've suggested is this concept of medical savings accounts which gives you tax-free dollars, to be able to go out and afford prescription drugs.

talked about this for years, I talk about it at my town meetings all the time, I say 'look, we know that the social security trust fund will be bankrupt, we know this. This is not a speculation..." And I said, you know, we have options, your options are raise taxes, cut benefits, or, for that generation that, that, you know, we're talking about, push the retirement age back a little bit.

DS: What year would that be?

RS: 2026, or 29 or something like that, I forget...

DS: Do you have any support from senior citizens organizations?

RS: Yeah, ah, shoot, I can't remember the name, we'll get it to you. There is, one senior citizens organization has endorsed me.

Negative Ads:

DS: Are you saying you've never shown any negative ads or attack ads?

RS: I just said he has not -

DS: Well have you?

RS: Oh, we've, we've run very positive ads. We've talked about -

DS: No, any attack ads.

RS: We've run ads talking about his position on the issues, certainly. But I certainly haven't taken anything he said out of context...

DS: What about the James Carville ad?

RS: That was, that's nothing that *Senator Wofford* said out of context. Nor is it anything, I mean the James Carville ad was a statement that he made, that I guarantee you he believes it. Cause he does it all the time and here's a classic example. That he's taking something that he knows is a lie, he knows is a lie, context. Nor is it anything, I mean the James Carville ad was a statement that he made, that I guarantee you he believes it. Cause he does it all the time and here's a classic example. That he's taking something that he knows is a lie, he knows is a lie, context. ~~Nor is it anything, he admitted in the debate as much~~ statement that he made, that I guarantee you he believes it. Cause he does it all the time and here's a classic example. That he's taking something that he knows is a lie, he knows is a lie, and, absolutely positively, he admitted in the debate as much that he knew it was a lie. Ah, and he's running it anyway.

about the Bill of Rights. That they believe that each of the Bill of Rights is there for a very specific reason, and that our founding fathers had a good idea of what was important to put in that. And they put the second amendment as well as all the other amendments to protect individuals from the govt. That's what the fourth amendment about the, uh, you know, illegal search and seizure, or the eighth amendment about cruel and unusual punishment from the govt. It was to protect individuals from a powerful govt. that was gonna try to dictate and control their lives. So when people talk about limiting the bill of rights, you really do strike a chord with a lot of Americans and you shouldn't limit any of the Bill of Rights without a very substantial reason to do so. You have to have a pretty high burden of proof to go forth and limit those rights that are put forth by our founding fathers. And so it does invoke a lot of passion for people, and it invokes for me. I don't think any of the Bill of Rights is an absolute right. There certainly are limitations on speech, on, uh, the second amendment, on the tenth amendment, on all of the amendments. But you have to have that proof, that burden that makes sure that we have a substantial societal effect by limiting those rights. And when you look at assault weapons, semi-automatic weapons, they may look ugly, they look bad, but only according to New Jersey, 0.14 percent of all violent crimes committed were committed by these semi-automatic weapons. Less than one percent nationwide are committed by these semi-automatic weapons. And it's hardly substantial proof that this is a major societal problem that we need to restrict people's freedom to solve 0.14 percent of all these violent crimes. You know, the first amendment's a very important amendment. Now I look to some speakers, I mean, all over the country you see speakers get up and they say very inflammatory things and horrible things, things that look bad and make you feel uncomfortable. But I defend their right to say it because that's the freedom that we fought and we died for in many of the wars that we fought in this country. And that's the freedom that I think really upsets a lot of voters in this state.

that's the freedom that we fought and we died for in many of the wars that we fought in this country. And that's the freedom that I think really upsets a lot of voters in this state.

things and horrible things, things that look bad and make you feel uncomfortable. But I defend their right to say it because that's the freedom that we fought and we died for in many of the wars that we fought in this country. And that's the freedom that I think really upsets a lot of voters in this state.

that's the freedom that we fought and we died for in many of the wars that we fought in this country. And that's the freedom that I think really upsets a lot of voters in this state.

RS on College Loans and Mortgages:

Question: You went to college on student loans, got a subsidized

there, and, while I have been on the ways and means committee, which I serve on, and, and on the floor of the house, again, another strong supporter of that program, because I think we do need to have programs for low and middle income people to help them get that first home, to help them get the start on the American dream, absolutely. But I don't think its a good idea to include that in a package where we're raising taxes on the middle class, which is exactly what we did on that tax bill that Senator Wofford voted for. We raised taxes on home heating oil, we raised taxes on gasoline, we raised taxes on senior citizens, middle income seniors. Um, you could go on down the list of the taxes that were raised that not only destroyed jobs and hurt middle income individuals, and lower income individuals at that. I wasn't willing to trade off all those taxes for a couple of programs that, even though I supported, didn't sway my opinion enough to vote for something like that.

RS answers question about why he co-sponsored HR 1910, which deals with punitive damages. Questioner specifies infringed right to sue a drug manufacturer. Second question: why RS opposed Family and Medical leave.

RS: Re. punitive damages, our legal system in this country is the most expensive legal system in the world. And I don't have to tell you that we have ten times as many lawyers as they do in most expensive legal system in the world. And I don't have to tell you that we have ten times as many lawyers as they do in Japan, and it's probably the same number as across the world. We have a system that just continues to drive up costs in this country. You know those punitive damages you talk about, those awards of millions and millions of dollars, who pays for that? Everybody does, in higher drug prices, higher prices at the store for a whole variety of products. What we should do is compensate people for the damages they incurred. There shouldn't be a lottery, ma'am. You shouldn't be able to hit the lottery with a lawsuit and win millions of dollars because you have a smart lawyer. The cost of those million-dollar awards is spread across every person buying that piece of medicine the next time, low-income individuals who simply can't afford it, because we keep lawsuit and win millions of our legal system. It's not fair. lawyer. The cost of those million-dollar awards is spread across every person buying that piece of medicine the next time, low-income individuals who simply can't afford it, because we keep driving up the price because of our legal system. It's not fair. All we do is tax everybody. It's really just a big tax. It's not fair. No other country in the world does it. NO other country in the world does it. We are unique. We have a very powerful lobby that keeps that in place. The trial lawyers. They contribute 25% of all Harris Wofford's money comes from trial lawyers. It's no wonder he opposes any reform of the legal system to cut people a break, particularly lower-income people a break.

With respect to Family and Medical Leave, you know, I was in Congress at the time that that was originally debated, and obviously did not vote for it and with very good reason. I held Town Meeting after Town Meeting. I went around and talked with businesses and with employees. You know what I found? Is that most employers and employees, if there's a problem, the employer works with the employee to give them time off to take care of a

10/18/94

LaSalle University

Political Science Department Forum

12:30 pm, Student Union Building, Dunley Auditorium

From Intro:

RS: That's one aspect of where you are in the future getting ripped off. The second is the amount of debt and the interest that you're going to have to pay, and the percentage of your income that's going to go just to retire the debt that we've been building up because we have politicians that are afraid to set priorities, who are afraid to come out and make tough decisions about where we should spend money and how - one of the things I've been criticized in this campaign repeatedly for by my opponent is that I voted against extending of unemployment benefits, and I voted against flood relief, which was not to Pennsylvania, but to the mid-west, and, quote, other kinds of disaster assistance bills like the LA riots, as if the LA riots was a natural disaster, but, never the less, we funded it like one to the tune of 6 billion dollars. All of these programs were 5, 6, 7, and in some cases 12 billion dollars spending that was not paid for. In other words, it was new spending that simply went on to add to the deficit. We didn't offset it by taking money from somewhere else in the budget and saying, OK, we have an emergency, we have a flood in the mid-west, we have some people who need some federal disaster assistance, fine, let's take some money from some other place in the budget, we've got 1.5 trillion dollars that we're spending, certainly we can find 5 billion of it somewhere in there, and shift the money over to pay for it. The President and others refused to do so. They didn't want to pay for it, they just wanted to add it to the deficit and let you pay for it for the rest of your lives, which you will, cause you will pay interest on that 5 billion dollars forever. And so you will be paying for it. I don't think that's right. I think that if we're going to make priorities about spending in our society we got to do it and not go always to future generations and ask them to do more. It is easy to get you to pay more.... it. I don't think that's right. I think that if we're going to make priorities about spending in our society we got to do it and not go always to future generations and ask them to do more. It is easy to get you to pay more....

From Intro:

RS: That's one aspect of where you are in the future getting ripped off. The second is the amount of debt and the interest that you're going to have to pay, and the percentage of your income that's going to go just to retire the debt that we've been building up because we have politicians that are afraid to set priorities, who are afraid to come out and make tough decisions about where we should spend money and how - one of the things I've been criticized in this campaign repeatedly for by my opponent is that I voted against extending of unemployment benefits, and I voted against flood relief, which was not to Pennsylvania, but to the mid-west, and, quote,

favor of keeping criminals, uh, repeat offenders off the street. A) How do you propose to do that? and B) If it's building more prisons, do you think that we can afford such an action, because I don't see any other way to keep repeat offenders off the street other than keeping them in prison longer.

RS: Yeah, obviously, there's an issue with prison-construction. I'm a supporter of building more prisons. I have never had a constituent come up to me and say that they were unwilling to pay more taxes to put violent criminals in jail. They were more than willing to pay those extra dollars to build a prison necessary to keep people who should be kept out of society out of society. Uh, and I think that's pretty broadly felt. The issue is, go look at a federal prison these days. They just built one in Schuylkill County with wall-to-wall carpeting, cable television in every room. I mean it's an unbelievable exorbitance. I mean Arlen Specter told me when he went through it, and Arlen is no raving conservative, Arlen Specter told me when he visited it the other day that the furniture in this place is nicer than the furniture in his own house. I mean it is unbelievable what we do. I mean people improve their quality of life going to prison these days. In some cases. And so what we need to do, if we're going to build new prisons, let's build 'em as PRISONS. Let's cut some corners. Make sure we have, you know, basic amenities and that's it. I mean in this, in this prison there is a basketball court, full basketball court, and running track. It's nice. And weight rooms. That's all we need is better fit violent criminals [big laugh] you know, to go out and really wreak havoc on the rest of us. I mean that's the kind of stupid stuff that we seem to do. I mean because we're concerned about the, you know, rehabilitating these people. Let's try to prevent them from getting there in the first place and make this as unpleasant an experience as possible. And maybe they won't wanna come back. Because if you look at rehabilitation . . . [tape end]

supporter of building more prisons. I have never had a constituent come up to me and say that they were unwilling to pay more taxes to put violent criminals in jail. They were more than willing to pay those extra dollars to build a prison necessary to keep people who should be kept out of society out of society. Uh, and I think that's pretty broadly felt. The issue is, go look at a federal prison these days. They just built one in Schuylkill County with wall-to-wall carpeting, cable television in every room. I mean it's an unbelievable exorbitance. I mean Arlen Specter told me when he went through it, and Arlen is no raving conservative, Arlen Specter told me when he visited it the other day that the furniture in this place is nicer than the furniture in his own house. I mean it is unbelievable what we do. I mean people improve their quality of life going to prison these days. In some

memo

TO: STU\MAX
FROM: TIM
DATE: 10 October 1994
LOCATION: Somerset County, Seven Springs Resort
TYPE OF MEETING: Town and County Commissioners Convention
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 100 people, mostly Republicans
ATTENDING MEDIA: None

The main concern of the meeting was the emissions legislation. Despite the fact this particular piece of legislation originated at the state level, most of the questions were about emissions control. The subject of the Clean Air Act was also addressed.

"I wasn't in Congress when the Clean Air Act passed.
So, you can't blame for that one."

Also, the topic of Pell Grants was addressed.

"Finally, and this is something that- another clear difference between the guy who is running for office for the something that I am with me. And that is Pell Grants. It's not loans- grants so they can go to college. People who are on life sentences, so they can go to law school. So they can sue us, so can cause us more- and cause us to clog up our legal system, so we can pay more taxes to help them get out of jail after they raped and murdered twenty people.

DATE: 10 October 1994
LOCATION: Somerset County, Seven Springs Resort
TYPE OF MEETING: Town and County Commissioners Convention
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About 100 people, mostly Republicans
ATTENDING MEDIA: None

The main concern of the meeting was the emissions legislation. Despite the fact this particular piece of legislation originated at the state level, most of the questions were about emissions control. The subject of the Clean Air Act was also addressed.

"I wasn't in Congress when the Clean Air Act passed.
So, you can't blame for that one."

MEMO

TO: STU

FROM: TIM

DATE: 5 July 1994

LOCATION: Warren, Warren County, Northeast Bank, Hospitality Room

TYPE OF MEETING: Town meeting on health care

CROWD DESCRIPTION: 15-20 people, businessmen and local Republicans

MEDIA COVERAGE: Warren Times Observer, USAToday Washington

RS began by discussing the Kennedy/Wofford health bill.

HW believes we need to take more of your money, sent it Washington, hire bureaucrats, set up an agency to tell you what's best for you.

RS spoke on HW, and stated that he hasn't been to Warren County.

Senator Wofford, since he has been elected, has never been to Warren County, but don't feel bad; there's about twenty other counties he hasn't been to, since he's been elected to the United States Senate.

Back to the issue of debates, and HW's refusal to debate in Warren County.

HW refused to debate. He's refused to stand up and defend his big government approach to solve the health care problem.

RS spoke of the specifics of Kennedy's bill.

The first thing he did, when he helped pass this bill out of committee, was break his number one promise in the 1991 election. He was going to get a health reform bill that wasn't going to cost, wasn't going to raise any taxes, wasn't going to cost anybody anything. We were just going to improve the efficiencies of the current system and provide health care to everyone. Let me tell you what this bill that he just voted for and supports didn't cost. Employer premiums, they call it premiums because people don't necessarily know what premiums are. Let me translate for you- just going to tax the inefficiencies of the current system and provide health care to everyone. Let me tell you what this bill that he just voted for and supports didn't cost. Employer premiums, they call it premiums because people don't necessarily know what premiums are. Let me translate for you- An employer tax- up to 12% of payroll. 12% payroll tax, like Social Security tax. 12% employer share payroll tax. Employee premium translation- employee

TYPE OF MEETING: Town meeting on health care

CROWD DESCRIPTION: 15-20 people, businessmen and local Republicans

MEDIA COVERAGE: Warren Times Observer, USAToday Washington

RS began by discussing the Kennedy/Wofford health bill.

HW believes we need to take more of your money, sent it Washington, hire bureaucrats, set up an agency to tell you what's best for you.

RS spoke on HW, and stated that he hasn't been to Warren County.

Senator Wofford, since he has been elected, has never been to Warren

What he [HW] will do is hide behind gimmicks like paying for his own health insurance, and gimmicks like joining with the AFL-CIO and saying 'Well, we should have the same health care system as good a members of Congress.' When, in fact is, most of the people in the private sector have

Let me talk, just for a second, about the myth, and this is something that gets my goat, and I know, Harris, you've heard me say this a million times. And yet he continues to perpetrate the lie. And the media, particularly in Washington, is particularly terrible at perpetrating this lie. That is, that there is such a thing as universal coverage. There is no such thing. There is not one country in the world that has universal coverage for every member of their society.

RS also addressed welfare reform.

There no question that welfare reform is more of a crisis in America than anything else. It is what is destroying a lot the fabric of our society. But is not the politically correct thing to be for right now.

Again, RS stated that universal health care is a myth.

You've heard my feeling universal health care. First off, it's a myth, and secondly, it's the wrong thing for America. It doesn't get to where you want to go which is getting as many people covered as possible. Under the system that the Republicans are putting forth, there is no question in my mind, we will cover- there will be more people insured after what we do, than will be insured after what they want to do.

their society.

RS also addressed welfare reform.

There no question that welfare reform is more of a crisis in America than anything else. It is what is destroying a lot the fabric of our society. But is not the politically correct thing to be for right now.

Again, RS stated that universal health care is a myth.

You've heard my feeling universal health care. First off, it's a myth, and secondly, it's the wrong thing for America. It doesn't get to where you want to go which is getting as many people covered as possible. Under the

STATE PARTY

OUR POSSIBLE STATEMENT

R S DOESN'T WANT TO OFFER PEOPLE WHAT HE GETS BAD THING

Santorum Quote

"Ah, one of the things that, that we believe, I believe will happen if ah, over the next couple of years is we'll do something on reforming the health care system, ah and I think we'll do something to help lower-income people ah be able to afford health insurance. Ah, I'm very hopeful that it won't be the Clinton plan, or the Wofford plan. Ah, Senator Wofford was quoted in Altoona, and I can't believe you did this Senator, but ah, he was quoted in Altoona as saying that the Clinton plan is over regulatory and bureaucratic. Ah, and so now he's beginning to distance himself, as he does with everything, I mean he just hops all over the place -- Senator Waffle -- he just hops all over the place on these things. Ah, he's in Central Pennsylvania so he has to talk like a conservative. Ah, and he came out and said 'What we really need to do is my bill' which is a lot more simple, it's only 87 pages or something like that. He said, well-. His bill is Senator Daschle's bill, ah which he is a cosp--, cosigner of, ah, and his bill is simple: it's a Canadian system. You turn it over to the federal government. It's a single-payer system. Yea, it's simple, the government does everything. Ah, yeah, we can do. we can. we can make everything very simple, Senator, if we just, if we all go out and work and pay taxes, and the government, and the government just does everything for us. Why don't we just do that? Ah, so, I mean, there, there is a simplicity in having the government doing everything for us, but it doesn't necessarily lead to a society that ah, that rewards the kind of responsible behavior that we want to encourage in this country."

-- Congressman Rick Santorum
Welfare Reform Town Meeting
Bristol Township Municipal Building
April 9, 1994, 1:00-2:00PM.

WATER TIMES
April 9, 1994, 1:00-2:00PM. THIS WAS

BUCKS COUNTY WATER TIMES
WHEN THIS WAS

happen if ah, over the next couple of years is we'll do something on reforming the health care system, ah and I think we'll do something to help lower-income people ah be able to afford health insurance. Ah, I'm very hopeful that it won't be the Clinton plan, or the Wofford plan. Ah, Senator Wofford was quoted in Altoona, and I can't believe you did this Senator, but ah, he was quoted in Altoona as saying that the Clinton plan is over regulatory and bureaucratic. Ah, and so now he's beginning to distance himself, as he does with everything, I mean he just hops all over the place -- Senator Waffle -- he just hops all over the place on these things. Ah, he's in Central Pennsylvania so he has to talk like a conservative. Ah, and he came out and said 'What we really need to do is my bill' which is a lot more simple, it's only 87 pages or

MEMO

To: Stuart
 From: Marshall
 Date: 05/05
 Re: RS Interview on WVCH, 04/05
 Speak Up Philadelphia, Host: Bill Devlin

Comments:

The first portion of the interview is difficult to hear. RS's phone fades in and out, allowing the viewer to hear only a few phrases from each sentence.

After a couple of minutes, it cleared up. The following is a transcript of the intelligible interview:

Interviewer: Speak to listeners who are committed to 'pro-family policies'. "Speak to the families that are listening, the ah the Moms that are home with their children here this afternoon, the housewives, ah, speak to them a little bit about what you would have to offer them as a Senator."

RS: "Well, I think, if you look at my voting record, we've been very solidly in, number 1, in support of ah families. Ah, I have a hundred percent pro-life voting record in the Congress, and will (unintelligible: continue?) that as long as I'm in Congress, and ah I have been very strong in, in programs that ah that really, really go back to some of the, some of the, the sound, moral programs that I think are important. For example, I've been a very strong advocate of abstinence-based education, one of the-. Ah, I've been actually the leader in Congress on a program called Title 20, which is a program devoted -- the only federal program that's out there that actually funds ah agencies, ah private agencies ah that go out and teach abstinence-based education, and ah in fact, I carried the ball and made sure that that was refunded again last year. Ah, so we've been very active in ah, in, in supporting families on those social issues and also on economic issues. I've been a leading advocate of a, ah, of a 500 dollar child tax credit, of ah, for, for each ah child dependent that you have in the home, so we can let families keep ah the money they earn instead of turning it over to the federal government, ah so we aren't forcing a lots ah, a lot of ah, ah of Mom's out of the house to work -- ah if they wanna work, dependent that you have in the home, so we can let families keep ah the money they earn instead of turning it over to the federal government, ah so we aren't forcing a lots ah, a lot of ah, ah of Mom's out of the house to, to work -- ah if they wanna work, that's fine -- but we shouldn't be forcing them out because of tax policy that robs them of all the money ah that, that's being

Comments:

The first portion of the interview is difficult to hear. RS's phone fades in and out, allowing the viewer to hear only a few phrases from each sentence.

After a couple of minutes, it cleared up. The following is a transcript of the intelligible interview:

Interviewer: Speak to listeners who are committed to 'pro-family policies'. "Speak to the families that are listening, the ah the Moms that are home with their children here this afternoon, the housewives, ah, speak to them a little bit about what you would have to offer them as a Senator."

billion, 500 dollar tax credit ah for working families. Unfortunately, it lost. It got ah -- about 90 percent of the Republicans voted for it, and, and about ah half a dozen or so Democrats voted for it, but it, it was defeated on pretty much a straight party line vote. Ah, we're gonna have an opportunity to continue to fight this battle, because there's a lot of us who believe ah that we have to cut federal spending and cut out a lot of these programs that are supposed to help the family ah that spend a lot of money ... (fades out for a second, then back in) ... to ah to frankly not do anything to help families unless ... (fades out again) "

Interviewer talks about Title 20 (abstinence-based education), comparing it to Title 10 (contraceptive/sex education). Attacks Sens. Kennedy, Boxer, Feinstein and Rep. Schroeder for gutting funding for Title 20.

RS interrupts: "Yeah, you're absolutely right. In fact, ah, ah, it was a-, it was actually the fall of 1993 where they, they basically gutted the funding mechanism and, and ah and turned it into another condom distribution program which we, ah y'know which we're very upset about, and are, and when the Appropriation bill comes up again, we're gonna try to get that money ah back to where it should be, should be spent, and, and I can tell you just last year when I fought this battle, y'know sometimes you have to make deals with people that you don't normally have to make deals with. So I made a deal with the Democrats, I said 'Pat, ah y'know, I'm gonna continue to fi-, y'know, we're gonna ah have this program, and if you don't move to eliminate the funding, I won't move to increase it.' Ah, and I'm not too sure we had the votes to increase it, and I was afraid she had the votes to cut it, so we were able to refund it again at around 7 million dollars. Just to give you an idea, we spend well over a hundred million dollars on Title 10, and less than, and less than 8 million dollars on Title 20 -- the Adolescent Family Life Program is what it's called -- [Interviewer interjects "Yes"] and ah, and two-thirds of that money by the way goes to help mothers who have children, ah y'know, particularly teenage Moms who have children who need support services. So what we're doing is y'know just exactly what the, what the, um, ah, the pro-choice people say that we don't do which is ah willing to put up money to help support families who make that tough decision, and ah that's what who need support services. So what we're doing is y'know just exactly what the, what the, um, ah, the pro-choice people say that we don't do which is ah willing to put up money to help support families who make that tough decision, and ah that's what the Title 20 money was for. That's what she cut out in addition to the other money for abstinence-based education, and believe it continue to fight this battle, because there's a lot of us who believe ah that we have to cut federal spending and cut out a lot of these programs that are supposed to help the family ah that spend a lot of money ... (fades out for a second, then back in) ... to ah to frankly not do anything to help families unless ... (fades out again) "

Interviewer talks about Title 20 (abstinence-based education), comparing it to Title 10 (contraceptive/sex education). Attacks Sens. Kennedy, Boxer, Feinstein and Rep. Schroeder for gutting funding for Title 20.

RS interrupts: "Yeah, you're absolutely right. In fact, ah, ah, it was a-, it was actually the fall of 1993 where they, they basically gutted the funding mechanism and, and ah and turned it into another condom distribution program which we, ah y'know

the time, it was the Children, Youth, and Families Committee, and ah Pat Schroeder was the Chairman. I was on that Committee, and ah y'know, she issued some report, ah, oh about a year and a half ago that sh-, that, that quoted her mind determined that abstinence education is a failure, that it never worked, and the fact of the matter is we have evidence after evidence that if you have abstinence education targeted at adolescents, and, and, and folks who are y'know, it, it just getting into that, that sexually active period of time, it is an incredibly effective program, and it is in fact the right approach that, that more and more teens are beginning to embrace as really the way to ah ah to solve the problem not only of unwanted pregnancies in this country, but sexually transmitted disease, AIDS, and a whole host of other problems that, that go along with it."

Interviewer praises RS for this stance, then brings up issue of riverboat gambling.

RS: "Everybody's looking for a quick, easy way out, and I, I, I am not a supporter of riverboat gambling. Hav-, y'know having said that, ah y'know, Philadelphia is free to do what Philadelphia wants to do. I'm not for federal, y'know, any kind of federal laws that ah, ah that have anything to do with that, but I, I am--. They're talking about the same thing, ah Bill, out here in Pittsburgh, and, and I've been very public in my feeling that that, I think what that does is ah, ah, really prey on people who ah. ah y'know. shouldn't be in the city of Philadelphia gambling in the first place, number 1, and number 2, I, I think it brings an element to the city that is not exactly a positive element."

Interviewer asks rhetorical question if Philadelphia needs any more organized crime.

RS interrupts: "I think what, I think what we need is a responsible fiscal policy. We wouldn't have to be looking for other sources of revenue if, if what we do is ah get that city of Philadelphia in shape, and get the state of Pennsylvania in shape, and, and give the taxpayers a break, and start running government efficiently, and start cutting some of the waste. I mean, I, I'm very proud of the fact that, as I mentioned, that I've introduced more bills to cut the budget than any other Member of Congress. It isn't hard, just ah, just look at where government efficiently, and start cutting some of the waste. I mean, I, I'm very proud of the fact that, as I mentioned, that I've introduced more bills to cut the budget than any other Member of Congress. It isn't hard, just ah, just look at where the money is, y'know, just look and set priorities. There are programs there I would out that may in fact be worthwhile. Fact of the matter is we have evidence after evidence that if you have abstinence education targeted at adolescents, and, and, and folks who are y'know, it, it just getting into that, that sexually active period of time, it is an incredibly effective program, and it is in fact the right approach that, that more and more teens are beginning to embrace as really the way to ah ah to solve the problem not only of unwanted pregnancies in this country, but sexually transmitted disease, AIDS, and a whole host of other problems that, that go along with it."

Interviewer praises RS for this stance, then brings up issue of riverboat gambling.

RS: "Everybody's looking for a quick, easy way out, and I, I, I am not a supporter of riverboat gambling. Hav-, y'know having said that, ah y'know, Philadelphia is free to do what

RS: "Well, I mean, ah obviously, the answer to that is ah a resounding yes. I think we have a great opportunity in the state of Pennsylvania to ah, to really make an impact on the national level. This will probably be the highest visibility Senate race in the country. Not only will, is Harris Wofford considered the ah, ah, y'know the poster child for the Clinton Administration, having won in 1991 just before the presidential election, ah but his political adviser, Jim Carville, James Carville, will be th-, is the same political adviser who runs the political operation out of the White House. Ah, the President will be in here, all the Cabinet people will be in here. This will be a very big race, a referendum election on the Clinton presidency. Ah, you wanna send a message, you wanna make an impact, in not only sending who believes very differently than Harris Wofford to go down and vote and represent your interest, but also to send ah send a very clear message of ah, ah of rejection of the Clinton ah, Clinton ah, agenda, this is the race to do it, so ah, if ah, and I can tell you every vote will matter. Ah, I, y'know I ran my, I won my first race, it was a close one. I was outspent 3 to 1, and I won it by less than, less than a percentage point, ah because we went out, and we hustled, and we got people, and we had a lot of grassroots volunteers who went out and worked real hard, and that was the difference. We turned out ah 20 percent more Republican vote than Democratic vote, and that's why we won, because we went out and got people out to vote who probably didn't think it mattered, who were probably more shocked than anybody else, but everybody did their part. and that's what's ah, that's what makes ah success in politics -- everybody doing their part."

Interviewer asks about family issues, complaining about homosexuals in the government, subverting the interest of the American family: "... do families really matter to the people down in Washington, DC, or are they just being held hostage ah to the people of the alternative lifestyles, those people that have a high disposable income, that could donate ah 10 or 20 thousand dollars to someone's campaign?"

RS: "Well they matter if they, if they, if they mobilize and they're heard. I mean, that's ah, y'know politics is the, is the old squeaky wheel, and that is, y'know i-, y-, the, the old silent majority is actually out there, and they're, and they're

RS: "weren't they, the people you talk about, the folks who are, who they're heard. I mean, that's ah, y'know politics is the, is the old squeaky wheel, and that is, y'know i-, y-, the, the old silent majority is actually out there, and they're, and they're exa-, exactly the people you talk about, the folks who are, who are too busy, ah and, and what you have to do is recognize that y'know when you get up in the morning, you look in the mirror, having won in 1991 just before the presidential election, ah but his political adviser, Jim Carville, James Carville, will be th-, is the same political adviser who runs the political operation out of the White House. Ah, the President will be in here, all the Cabinet people will be in here. This will be a very big race, a referendum election on the Clinton presidency. Ah, you wanna send a message, you wanna make an impact, in not only sending who believes very differently than Harris Wofford to go down and vote and represent your interest, but also to send ah send a very clear message of ah, ah of rejection of the Clinton ah, Clinton ah, agenda, this is the race to do it, so ah, if ah, and I can tell you every vote will matter. Ah, I, y'know I ran my, I won my first race, it was a close one. I was outspent 3 to 1, and I won it by less than, less than a percentage point, ah because we went out, and we hustled, and we got people, and we

who stood in front of the tank at Tianemenn Square when it comes to the future of our soci-, civilization in this country, and ah and I don't know if I can say it any more strongly than that. It matters. It counts. You can make a difference, but you gotta get up and be heard."

Interviewer asks RS about what issues he differs with HW on.

RS: "Well, I mean ah, it, it almost, you'd need a, you'd need a, a long show just to go down the laundry list. One of the, one of the nice things about this race, ah as reported by a couple of the local papers here in Pittsburgh, ah who editorialized after I announced is that unlike a lot of elections in Pennsylvania where you have a choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, you've got real choices here. On health care it really comes back to the fundamental issue: do you believe we solve problems in this country by giving the government more power, more responsibility, more decision-making, more resources, ah fro-, taken from you so they can tell you what's best for you, or do you believe that the answer to the problem of health care reform is to give, is to let you keep more of your own money, ah make more of your decisions, and create a, a y'know create a level playing field where you have the right incentives to go out and be a good consumer of health care? That's what I believe the answer is. That's what our solution supplies, and it keeps choices, it keeps decisions, it keeps money with you, not Washington, who's who thinks they know better than you. And the same really comes down whether it's a Clinton tax package, or deficit reduction package, or welfare reform, which we're very involved in. I believe in the government's ability to do good for you, and the more government we have in our lives the better off you will be, and I just believe-, I trust you, not a bunch of bureaucrats who get paid to, to work 9 to 5, and who don't care whether your little daughter gets her, her, her treatment ah at the hospital, and don't care if ah, if that person who's on welfare finds a job and gets back to work, they get paid no matter what. That's the real difference between the two of us."

Overview: Nothing earth-shattering in this interview. I think his diatribe about Title 10 is interesting, and worth checking into. Also, by implication, he attacks homosexuals, although no usable statements. All in all, he managed to make rather moderate statements, while using a very conservative theme/undertone to appeal to his audience.

The sections in bold are sections that I think are worth looking at. either to use as quotes or to check into the truth of RS: "Well, I mean ah, it, it almost, you'd need a, you'd need a, a long show just to go down the laundry list. One of the, one of the nice things about this race, ah as reported by a couple of the local papers here in Pittsburgh, ah who editorialized after I announced is that unlike a lot of elections in Pennsylvania where you have a choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, you've got real choices here. On health care it really comes back to the fundamental issue: do you believe we solve problems in this country by giving the government more power, more responsibility, more decision-making, more resources, ah fro-, taken from you so they can tell you what's best for you, or do you believe that the answer to the problem of health care reform is to give, is to let you keep more of your own money, ah make more of your decisions, and create a, a y'know create a level playing field where you have the right incentives to go out and be a good consumer of

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Date: 05/23/94
Re: RS Welfare Sound Bite -- Morning Edition, NPR, 04/21

Comments:

The NPR story reported on the different Congressional welfare reform plans being forwarded in the absence of a complete Clinton plan. The report began with a description and sound-bite of the bipartisan Harkin-Bond plan.

The NPR reporter then disclosed that Republicans are quarreling amongst themselves "over whether the House GOP welfare reform plan is tough enough", citing the public memo released by Empower America criticizing RS's plan. Empower America, led by Kemp, Bennett, and Weber, proposed to eliminate all benefits to unwed mothers under 21. That proposal will be a key component of a competing GOP welfare reform bill to be introduced by Talent (R-MO). (Obtaining copy tomorrow)

The reporter continued: "But the author of the existing House GOP bill, Pennsylvania's Rick Santorum, accuses his conservative colleagues of political posturing, and says their proposal on unwed mothers is too hard-edged." Cut to RS voice-over.

... what we've done over the last 30 years in the welfare system in this country is create a dependency cycle, is, is destroy the family unit, encourage, in fact, ah the fathers and mothers to walk away from their children. Ah, I would suggest that ah we have a responsibility to try to deal with the problem ah in a positive fashion, not walk away from it, just when we've ah created the biggest mess ah welfare system that maybe the world has seen."

The reporter concluded that despite their differences, Republicans agree that the Clinton Administration's failure to introduce a bill has enabled them to set some of the terms of the debate.

RS Welfare Sound Bite -- Morning Edition, NPR, 04/21

Comments:

The NPR story reported on the different Congressional welfare reform plans being forwarded in the absence of a complete Clinton plan. The report began with a description and sound-bite of the bipartisan Harkin-Bond plan.

The NPR reporter then disclosed that Republicans are quarreling amongst themselves "over whether the House GOP welfare reform plan is tough enough", citing the public memo released by Empower America criticizing RS's plan. Empower America, led by Kemp, Bennett, and Weber, proposed to eliminate all benefits to unwed mothers under 21. That proposal will be a key component of a competing GOP welfare reform bill to be introduced

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Victims' Rights Task Force Meeting
Location: Far NE Senior Citizens' Center
NE Philadelphia
Date: 04/29/94
Attendance: 50: 40 seniors, 10 local Republicans/businessmen
Media: None seen

Comments:

The meeting had three speakers: RS, Congresswoman Deborah Pryce from Columbus, Ohio, and Jim Hasher who is running for Congress. The meeting was centered around crime and victims' rights, but specifically addressed the problem of prison caps. There were about 35 senior citizens playing cards and chatting when RS arrived. Virtually all stayed for the meeting and got charged up by the heated rhetoric on crime. Also in attendance were a group of about 10 Republican/businessmen in suits -- obviously RS (or Hasher) supporters. A few seniors showed up specifically for the meeting. There did not appear to be any press presence.

RS began the meeting by introducing himself and proudly stating: "I am ah a co-chairman of a Victims' Rights Task Force in the House of Representatives, co-chaired by my colleague who is a Congresswoman from Ohio, Deborah Pryce. Deborah is right here [applause]. Ah, the two of us um, ah formed a task force in Washington, DC to ah to study the issue of victims' rights and how they are impacted by the criminal justice system and ah we're going to talk a little bit about what ah, ah about that ah idea, and in particular focus in on the issue of prison caps, and we'll discuss, ah, ah. If you're like me, before I ah got involved in this issue, I didn't know much about what prison caps were, but we're gonna talk a lot about that, and particularly, its dramatic impact on the city of Philadelphia and on crime in the city of Philadelphia.

Ah, the first thing we did when Deborah and I put together what prison caps were, but we're gonna talk a lot about that, and particularly, its dramatic impact on the city of Philadelphia and on crime in the city of Philadelphia.

Ah, the first thing we did when Deborah and I put together the, ah, ah, the, the, ah, ah Victims' Rights Task Force -- actually Deborah was the, the one who came up with the

NE Philadelphia
Date: 04/29/94
Attendance: 50: 40 seniors, 10 local Republicans/businessmen
Media: None seen

Comments:

The meeting had three speakers: RS, Congresswoman Deborah Pryce from Columbus, Ohio, and Jim Hasher who is running for Congress. The meeting was centered around crime and victims' rights, but specifically addressed the problem of prison caps. There were about 35 senior citizens playing cards and chatting when RS arrived. Virtually all stayed for the meeting and got charged up by the heated rhetoric on crime.

background with victims' rights, proceeding to outline the work of the VR Task Force: "So anyway, I was very pleased that Rick agreed to co-chair this very important work that we're doing in Washington, and one of the things that we're committed to doing is to get around to the rest of the country and get good ideas, and get in-, input from ah, ah all necks of the woods so to speak. I have a, a, a very brief ah prepared statement and I just wanted ah, ah, ah, to, to let you know that over the past 2 years, Rick has been a co-host of the National Organization of Victim Assistance Annual Forum on Victims' Rights, and that's one of the reasons that I thought he would be perfect to help me chair this group that I formed. His legal background and dedication to community service bring a very valuable perspective to our efforts in the area of victims' rights that I'm really looking forward to working with him."

She maintained that the #1 role of government is to help keep neighborhoods safe from crime. She continued that the judicial system depends on crime victims' participation; they deserve our support and understanding. She went on to describe the Task Force: "After decades of elevating the rights and needs of criminals, the American public has slowly begun to recognize that victims of crimes have rights too. And the Task Force that we're going to work together on um will work very hard to see that the Federal Government ensures fair treatment for innocent victims. With Rick's help and leadership, ~~the Task Force will help~~ give victims of crime a very meaningful voice in public policy process, and help them turn their anguish into action, to have a sounding board, to have a place where they can actually see their thoughts put into action." Worth noting is the continual use of the future tense when talking about the Task Force.

She talked about the crime bill as a step in the right direction, though it doesn't go far enough. "I believe that our task force can really pick up the ball, ah, now that the crime bill ah debate is over and carry on and, and to bring into effect what really needs done, to bring our experience, our mutual experiences, our collective experiences to play, and we really invite your input ah today. Thank you very, very much."

~~our mutual experiences, our collective experiences to play, and we really invite your input ah today. Thank you very, very much."~~

Jim Hasher, running as a Republican for the 3rd Congressional District seat, spoke next. RS introduced him as speak: I have a, a, a very brief ah prepared statement and I just wanted ah, ah, ah, to, to let you know that over the past 2 years, Rick has been a co-host of the National Organization of Victim Assistance Annual Forum on Victims' Rights, and that's one of the reasons that I thought he would be perfect to help me chair this group that I formed. His legal background and dedication to community service bring a very valuable perspective to our efforts in the area of victims' rights that I'm really looking forward to working with him."

She maintained that the #1 role of government is to help keep neighborhoods safe from crime. She continued that the judicial system depends on crime victims' participation; they deserve our support and understanding. She went on to describe the Task Force: "After decades of elevating the rights

caps and its effect on Philadelphia, and I don't know -- ah, I mean, it's, it's actually just, it's almost shocking ah what ah, what's going on here in the city of Philadelphia with respect to criminals, people charged with crimes, literally just being let out free, because ah we have judges, federal judges who ah don't want ah quote two people, as Jim said, two people in a prison cell, so we're gonna have them back out on the street committing more and more crimes. Ah, that's what goes on currently in Philadelphia today." He then cited a whole host of statistics on prison caps:

- * in Philly, the cap is at 3700 allowed in jails according to federal court, although there are 4200 prisoners in jails.

- * if charged with the following crimes, you are not put in jail to await trial: carjacking, stalking, drug-dealing, burglary, weaponless robbery, firearms violation, terroristic threats, car theft, drunk driving, manslaughter, vehicular homicide. "They can't hold you because you have a judge who says you can't put two people in a cell. That's in the city of Philadelphia, and you wonder why we have the crime problem that we have. This was the number 1 issue of the Victims' Rights organizations."

- * in 1991, over 8000 crimes were recorded by defendants who were arrested and released as a result of the prison caps. 77 of them were murders 851 burglaries, 2000 drug charges and over 1100 robberies.

- * 47% of defendants released under prison caps don't show up in court.

RS: "This is a very serious problem, particularly here in this city, and that's one of the reasons we wanted to come here today and we wanted to highlight this issue."

According to RS, a provision in crime bill attacks this issue, but doesn't go far enough. The provision is not retroactive, leaving the Philadelphia cap intact. His idea is a stricter prison cap reform, in which you can only be released from jail on an individual basis, appealing to the judge personally.

He then read a letter from Patrick Boyle, a Philadelphia police officer from a family of cops, who could not attend the event. His son, a 21-year old cop, was shot and killed on 02/04/91 by a man he stopped for traffic violations.

He then read a letter from Patrick Boyle, a Philadelphia police officer from a family of cops, who could not attend the event. His son, a 21-year old cop, was shot and killed on 02/04/91 by a man he stopped for traffic violations. "People in a prison cell, so we're gonna have them back out on the street committing more and more crimes. Ah, that's what goes on currently in Philadelphia today." He then cited a whole host of statistics on prison caps:

- * in Philly, the cap is at 3700 allowed in jails according to federal court, although there are 4200 prisoners in jails.

- * if charged with the following crimes, you are not put in jail to await trial: carjacking, stalking, drug-dealing, burglary, weaponless robbery, firearms violation, terroristic threats, car theft, drunk driving, manslaughter, vehicular homicide. "They can't hold you because you have a judge who says you can't put two people in a cell. That's in the city of Philadelphia, and you wonder why we have the crime problem that

Question about why sentences are never carried out, including the death penalty. RS answer: #1, endless habeas corpus appeals slow procedure. Proposed reform which has RS support is to limit the number of habeas corpus appeals to one. "Number 2 is the issue of prison caps, and, and that's why this is the number 1 issue for victims, because you have, you have, you have the criminal being, is, is basically with these prison caps claiming that they're the victim, that their rights are being violated, and they're the victims by having to sleep in the cell with somebody else. Ah, and it's the ultimate insult to someone who is a victim of a crime for that criminal to then say they are the victim."

In response to the same question, Deborah Pryce got off on a tangent: "So, I mean, I don't know why we have to have state-of-the-art health clubs inside a prison and cable TV and all the other stuff that they have. Ah, these guys are better off inside than they were outside. And so that's why prisons cost so much."

Question about the caning in Singapore. Deborah Pryce answer: "Well, they don't, they don't have that much crime over in Singapore, that's all I wanna say about it." Someone suggests a whipping post in City Hall. DP: "A whipping post in city hall, that's what she proposes. Well, a little public embarrassment goes a long way..." She goes on to say: "But, I'll tell you what, um, with cri-, crime wave and. and. and the awful nature of what's happening to this country, I think that, um, ah, ah a little caning could go a long way."

Question about whether criminals should have rights and/or special treatment. "Well, ma'am, the, the, and I think Congresswoman Pryce ah mentioned this, and, and the fact is you have a bunch of judges ah not only on the Supreme Court but ah all the way along ah who, who don't agree with this gentleman, and I think the majority of people in America, and you're right there are a lot, there are millions of people out here who don't agree with, with most of us, and a lo-, unfortunately a lot of them are federal judges, ha, and state judges, and what we have to do, we have the responsibility, an opportunity to change that. We can, we by, by passing laws, can overrule judges. One of the things that we did in this crime bill was to ah ah say that you're that if you're in jail, you're not gonna get Pell grants anymore. Ah we're not gonna give you your have the criminal being, is, is basically with these prison caps claiming that they're the victim, that their rights are being violated, and they're the victims by having to sleep in the cell with somebody else. Ah, and it's the ultimate insult to someone who is a victim of a crime for that criminal to then say they are the victim."

In response to the same question, Deborah Pryce got off on a tangent: "So, I mean, I don't know why we have to have state-of-the-art health clubs inside a prison and cable TV and all the other stuff that they have. Ah, these guys are better off inside than they were outside. And so that's why prisons cost so much."

Question about the caning in Singapore. Deborah Pryce answer: "Well, they don't, they don't have that much crime over

Question about white collar crime. RS answer: non-violent offenders should take up less tax dollars, whether in minimum security prisons or through alternative punishment.

Question on gun control. RS: "Well, let me, let me just suggest that gun prohibition works just about as well as alcohol prohibition and drug prohibition, and any other kind of prohibition. Ah, we have -- drugs are illegal, anybody have trouble in Northeast Philadelphia at getting drugs?"

Question about punishment fitting the crime. RS - "... See the problem is, the problem is that we just let people walk out. It's not the fact that they have, I mean we just, we don't prosecute and people don't do time, and the, and the certainty of punishment is gone. That's the problem, that people don't, people think they can just go through the system, and they'll be right back out."

Question about prison caps. According to a female RS aide, "someone came up with a number" and that was where the 3700 figure came from. RS went on to say: "There, there're, there're plenty of prison cells in the city of Philadelphia where there is only one person in the, in the cell, plenty of them. Ah so we can al- almost I wouldn't say double, but greatly increase the capacity if we remove this cap."

Question about difficulties for police to follow all the guidelines to arrest criminals. RS: "Y'know gosh, the way the courts are evolving, the rights of criminals keep getting... the courts because of minor technicalities even when officers acted in good faith. He then championed a bill to change these laws: "We tried to get this in the crime bill, and unfortunately ah, ah the, ah, the Democratic leadership of the Congress didn't want it. They di-, they wouldn't even allow us to vote it on the floor, weren't even allowed to bring it to the floor for a vote."

He attacked the Racial Justice provision concerning the death penalty in the Crime Bill. Penalties should have nothing to do with color at all, he argues. Moreover, if law this provision would put the burden on the prosecutor to prove that death penalties are not discriminatory rather than the other way around. "... and what, what most people would say is, if, if this ends up in the final version of the crime bill we will provision would put the burden on the prosecutor to prove that death penalties are not discriminatory rather than the other way around. "... and what, what most people would say is, if, if this ends up in the final version of the crime bill, we will provision would put the burden on the prosecutor to prove that death penalties are not discriminatory rather than the other way around. "... and what, what most people would say is, if, if this ends up in the final version of the crime bill, we will have no death penalties ever executed in this country..."

Asked how he would typefy the opponents of the tough provisions that he advocates for the crime bill. "Well, I think the word liberal comes to mind. Ah, most of, i-, it's funny, ah, it's, it's re-, it's sort of, it's sort of an incredible, incredible observation. I've only been in Congress ah a little over three years, three and a half years. Ah, one of the things I've noticed is that the same people who vote for all these controls on guns are the same people who vote against anything that, that makes criminals serve their sentences, or, or, or really answers the tough crime problems ah of making, of

and, and, and the, and what, what I'm amazed at is that the public buys it. They focus on an issue that is -- I mean, this, this assault weapons. Le-, less than 1% of all cri-, all crimes committed by-, with guns, not just all crimes, violent crimes, crimes committed with guns are with these assault weapons. I mean, this is, this is, this is a non-problem. I mean this is such a small, small part, yet this is the big issue for all these folks who don't wanna reform the death penalty procedures so people are executed, who don't wanna ah, amke sure that if a cop goes out and tries to do a good job that ah, that the evidence that he gets is, is, is able to be used, they don't wanna, they don't wanna let that happen; they don't wanna, they don't wanna -- they wanna keep prison caps. They want racial quotas for death sentence p-. These are the same people. Now don't you sort of scratch your head and wonder whether this, whether these folks are really for crime control or whether they're, ah they're just trying to look tough to the folks back home so they don't, so people don't see them for what they are -- a bunch of sympathizers of people who commit a lot of crimes, and the-, and and who aren't gonna support the, the average hard-working American ah who's out there ah trying to have his family and to be safe."

Follow-up question: "These people that you're talking about have names, do they not?"

RS: "Yeah, Harris Wofford would be one of them. (talk from the crowd) Bob Herbert might be another one, yeah..."

Overview: RS is strong on this issue. He pushed all the right buttons with this crowd. By the end they were very charged up. I think NE Philly is a conservative area, but still it was impressive. This issue is one that RS will exploit.

MEMO

To: Stuart
 From: Marshall
 Re: Tax Revolt Meeting
 Location: Hoffmann Insurance Agency
 Bethlehem
 Date: 04/15/94
 Attendance: 40 people, mostly businessmen in suits
 Media: Allentown Morning Call
 WAEB - 790 AM, 104.1 FM
 WFMZ - Channel 69
 Service Electric cable station in Allentown

Comments:

When I arrived RS had just begun his presentation. He was passing around a 'tax revolt postcard', expressing the outrage of angry taxpayers on Tax Day with the nation's largest tax increase in history. He started his talk with a diatribe against the Clinton/Wofford tax package: "And I always try to remind people, Harris Wofford was the 50th vote. Without his vote that bill would not have passed. Ah, so, it's very

He went on to attack the budget as long on taxes and short on spending cuts, slowing the present economic recovery: "Unfortunately, ah we were supposed to get some reductions in spending along with that, and unfortunately we did not. What the bill did was cut spending ah a little over 100 million dollars but if you look at the growth of spending over the next 5 years, federal spending will go up outside of defense will go up almost 35 percent over the next five years. So while he [Clinton] says they're cutting spending, they in fact are not cutting spending. In fact, we had a vote yesterday on the floor of the House to reduce spending by another 26 billion dollars, virtually nothing considering we're going to spend almost 9 trillion over the next five years, wanted to cut a cutting spending. In fact, we had a vote yesterday on the floor of the House to reduce spending by another 26 billion dollars, virtually nothing considering we're going to spend almost 9 trillion over the next five years, wanted to cut a measly 26 billion dollars. The Democrats said 'No'; the President said 'No'. Every time we come forward to cut

Date: 04/15/94
 Attendance: 40 people, mostly businessmen in suits
 Media: Allentown Morning Call
 WAEB - 790 AM, 104.1 FM
 WFMZ - Channel 69
 Service Electric cable station in Allentown

Comments:

When I arrived RS had just begun his presentation. He was passing around a 'tax revolt postcard', expressing the outrage of angry taxpayers on Tax Day with the nation's largest

expense of families: "One thing I'd like to talk about that I know is, affects every one of you, if not you directly, certainly, certainly friends and neighbors, and that's what we're doing to America's families. This is probably one of the most shocking charts that I, that I've, that I've ever seen, in, in how we have simply decimated the American family through the tax code. You always hear President Clinton and Harris Wofford and all the, all the folks who say they're for families, talk about 'We need to be pro-family, we need to help families'. Well, let's look how we've hurt families over the past 40 years in this country.

This chart shows the percentage of money you pay to the federal government in taxes over the course of the last 45 years. In 1950, the average-income American family paid less than 4 percent of their income to the federal government in taxes, 4 percent... Today that same average-income American family gives 25 percent of their income to the federal government in taxes, and it just went up again this year. 25 percent of their income goes to the federal government in taxes.

Taxpayer freedom day was just announced yesterday by the National Tax Foundation. It's two days later this year than it was last year, as a result of the Clinton tax increase. Today you'll have to work until May 4th here in Pennsylvania just to pay the taxes, state, local, state and federal taxes, ah to ah Washington and Harrisburg before you can start taking dollars home for yourself. It takes up until May 4th just to pay your, just to pay your tax bill. That's wrong. And what we need to do is to go back and help families by letting them keep their own money -- not as some in Washington would say 'give them money' as if it's our money to give -- but in fact let them keep their own money."

He outlined his views as to the principal reasons for growth in family taxes, pointing to social security hikes, from 2-3% to almost 8%, as accounting for about 5% of the growth of the family tax burden. But he estimated that the biggest reason was the government's reluctance to raise the dependent growth in family taxes, pointing to social security hikes, from 2-3% to almost 8%, as accounting for about 5% of the growth of the family tax burden. But he estimated that the biggest reason was the government's reluctance to raise the dependent deduction with inflation: "What we need to do is help families stay together. One of the principal reasons families have the tax code. You always hear President Clinton and Harris Wofford and all the, all the folks who say they're for families, talk about 'We need to be pro-family, we need to help families'. Well, let's look how we've hurt families over the past 40 years in this country.

This chart shows the percentage of money you pay to the federal government in taxes over the course of the last 45 years. In 1950, the average-income American family paid less than 4 percent of their income to the federal government in taxes, 4 percent... Today that same average-income American family gives 25 percent of their income to the federal government in taxes, and it just went up again this year. 25 percent of their income goes to the federal government in

credit for children. Your United States Senator, Mr. Wofford, voted against the 500 dollar dependent tax credit for children, because he wanted to keep more money going to Washington and less money for families." When asked about specific votes, RS likes to point out that he voted against a whole package, not simply one provision. Here, he attacks HW as voting against the tax credit in his vote against the Republican budget - hypocritical. Worth pointing out is that HW helped pass the Earned Income Tax Credit in the budget, while RS voted against it.

RS cites a statistic about the family tax credit that he uses to appeal to anti-government and anti-tax sentiment: "In fact, if you look at what the average American family pays in income taxes, for a family of four, if you gave a 500 dollar tax credit to that family, your tax bill to the federal government would be cut in half, as a result of this proposal. We believe it's important to give families a break." Might be worth checking.

Attack on HW as regulator and taxer in Harrisburg and DC, especially hurting small businesses: "The second thing I wanna talk about is what we're gonna do to help the business economy, because, ah - Mark hit the nail on the head and Tom did too - what we do to businesses, particularly here in the state of Pennsylvania. ~~My first thing for state times, but~~ ah I can tell you that ah Harris Wofford when he served here as Secretary of Labor and Industry in the Casey Administration has absolutely nothing to crow about what he did for labor and industry in this state over, during the years of the Casey Administration. They increased taxes on business to the highest business taxes in the country. We are movi-, we are basically forcing businesses out of this state and telling 'em: 'We're closed for business here in the state of Pennsylvania.'

In addition, not only did Harris Wofford during the Casey Administration support higher taxes and raids on the workers' comp. fund, but he went down to Washington and in his first term on the United States Senate, he voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the world. He voted for Casey Administration support higher taxes and raids on the workers' comp. fund, but he went down to Washington and in his first term on the United States Senate, he voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the world. He voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the world, and one of the biggest on who? On small businesses. The S- the tax credit in his vote against the Republican budget - hypocritical. Worth pointing out is that HW helped pass the Earned Income Tax Credit in the budget, while RS voted against it.

RS cites a statistic about the family tax credit that he uses to appeal to anti-government and anti-tax sentiment: "In fact, if you look at what the average American family pays in income taxes, for a family of four, if you gave a 500 dollar tax credit to that family, your tax bill to the federal government would be cut in half, as a result of this proposal. We believe it's important to give families a break." Might be worth checking.

Attack on HW as regulator and taxer in Harrisburg and

Americans. Let me tell you who these people are, this upper income tax bracket that he increased taxes on. 60 percent of the people who file in that new upper bracket that Bill Clinton created are small businesses. People who are out, who go out there and try to make ends meet, employ people, and what are we gonna do? We're gonna take 30 percent more money for the federal government in taxes which is gonna hurt employment and hurt small business which is the engine of employment in our economy." RS drew a lot of nods from the crowd of businessmen with this attack. It might be worthwhile to check that 60% statistic, to counter the argument. RS is more effective when he attacks the Clinton budget as harmful to small business and economic opportunity, than he is when he preaches supply-side economics. If we can counter the small business charge, we can pin RS as a proponent of trickle-down economics.

Here RS launches into his Reaganesque, simplistic lesson in economics -- that taxes always hurt the economy, resulting in less, not more tax revenue: "What, what this shows is that the higher the tax, the tax brackets you have, the the more taxes you try to get from the wealthiest Americans doesn't mean you get more revenues. In fact, the argument can be made you get less. Why? Because when you try to take more money from the rich, they do two things: Number one, they take money

ventures and put it in things that are non-taxable, and they just simply refuse to take risks. And as a result the economy slows down, less people are employed, less e-, less economic growth, a smaller pie, and as a result, they pay, they end up paying percentage-wise the same as we payed before. So the answer is not trying to grab more from those who have, it's try to expand the pie and, and make sure that more people have a piece of it.

And that's what, that's what this next chart show, is that when you cut taxes, when you give, when you give people a break and encourage them to make investments, what happens? Everybody wins. Jobs are created, and that's what the 19, the Reagan tax cut in 1981, happened in 1982, you saw a dramatic that when you cut taxes, when you give, when you give people a break and encourage them to make investments, what happens? Everybody wins. Jobs are created, and that's what the 19, the Reagan tax cut in 1981, happened in 1982, you saw a dramatic increase in jobs. What did we do in 1990, we increased taxes. In 1992, we increa-. '93 we increased taxes, and what happens? federal government in taxes which is gonna hurt employment and hurt small business which is the engine of employment in our economy." RS drew a lot of nods from the crowd of businessmen with this attack. It might be worthwhile to check that 60% statistic, to counter the argument. RS is more effective when he attacks the Clinton budget as harmful to small business and economic opportunity, than he is when he preaches supply-side economics. If we can counter the small business charge, we can pin RS as a proponent of trickle-down economics.

Here RS launches into his Reaganesque, simplistic lesson in economics -- that taxes always hurt the economy, resulting in less, not more tax revenue: "What, what this shows is that the higher the tax, the tax brackets you have, the the

defending the wealthy from taxes helps everyone – not an argument that I think will resonate well with the average American.

RS closes by discussing federal spending, taking a quick shot at HW: "Final thing I want to talk about and then I'll take some questions is the federal budget and federal spending. As I mentioned, yesterday we had a vote on the floor of the House to reduce spending some more. Senator Wofford, of course, opposed it in the Senate. We need, we need to make sure that we're gonna provide a future for our children, that we're gonna have some sense of sanity for our children as far as the federal deficit. And what we have to do is that everybody in America, everybody in Pennsylvania tell them: 'Cut spending first.' Let's go out and try to reduce the size of government do you can keep more of your money, and you can, and, and, and the federal government can live within a budget."

He exhibits a chart showing where the government spends money: 14% paying interest on federal debt, 35.6% on discretionary spending, and the rest on entitlements. He chronicles the growth of entitlement spending, pointing out that in JFK's last budget, entitlement spending was 1/2 discretionary spending, while today it's more than double. He went on to state, regarding entitlements and spending:

~~entitlement programs are programs we don't budget for every~~
year. We don't say at the beginning of the year 'We're gonna spend 200 billion dollars this year on Medicaid.' We spend whatever people are entitled to get, and so at the end of the year, we just add up the bill and this is how much we spend. We have absolutely no control on this system. So we have to do something to reform entitlements; we have to do something to cut spending. I've introduced more (unintelligible word) bills to cut spending than any other Member of Congress. You have to be serious about that if you're gonna provide an economic future for our children, because high deficits create a drag on the economy that's gonna hurt the economic future of our children and our economy." One item worth pointing out perhaps is that ~~he may have introduced more spending cuts than any other~~
for our children, because high deficits create a drag on the economy that's gonna hurt the economic future of our children and our economy." One item worth pointing out perhaps is that he may have introduced more spending cuts than any other Member, but none have passed. I pulled a quote today from a ~~newspaper article from 1993 which gave each legislator a~~
spending. As I mentioned, yesterday we had a vote on the floor of the House to reduce spending some more. Senator Wofford, of course, opposed it in the Senate. We need, we need to make sure that we're gonna provide a future for our children, that we're gonna have some sense of sanity for our children as far as the federal deficit. And what we have to do is that everybody in America, everybody in Pennsylvania tell them: 'Cut spending first.' Let's go out and try to reduce the size of government do you can keep more of your money, and you can, and, and, and the federal government can live within a budget."

He exhibits a chart showing where the government spends money: 14% paying interest on federal debt, 35.6% on discretionary spending, and the rest on entitlements. He

Item veto. I'm a supporter of the balanced budget Amendment. I mean, we have to have structural control, because you have folks like Bob Byrd and Harris Wofford who just simply want to spend, spend, spend, spend, and what we have to do is put some sort of control on those folks and put some sort of pressure that they have to live within a budget just like everyone of you have to live within a budget."

Answer to a question on entitlement spending and health care: "The two biggest reasons this, this ah, these ah entitlement costs are going up are two words: Medicare and Medicaid. They're growing at an exponentially fast rate, and anyone who will tell you that the government can control costs in health care if you just let us do it, look at Medicare and Medicaid. Medicaid over the past few years has grown at over 20 percent per year. Medicare has grown at over 14 percent a year. It is a joke to believe the federal government can control health care costs. They simply can't. Even, even the fact that those things are growing that fast, they still cost shift. They still shift costs onto the private sector from the government programs, and they still have their costs going out of control. Why? Because we're just, we just continue to pass more and more generous benefits, particularly in the area of Medicaid. We continue to expand the Medicaid population, and as a result the costs go up and up and up and up. What we need to do is to have some reforms in the marketplace that put you back involved in the equation. We, we need to bring you back in as consumers to do, so, so you can begin to make decisions on not only whether you want health care, but whether you want to spend money, and we do that with this concept of Medical Savings Accounts which gives everybody an account of money to go out and purchase health care, routine health care, before your insurance kicks in, and if you don't spend the money, you keep it. So you get a pot of money in an account, you get to be able to go out there and spend that money if you need it, and if you don't need it, you get to keep it, so now you have an incentive to be a good shopper and a good consumer of health care. So you get a pot of money in an account, you get to be able to go out there and spend that money if you need it, and if you don't need it, you get to keep it, so now you have an incentive to be a good shopper and a good consumer of health care."

Question on how to reduce national debt: "Well, as far as they have to live within a budget just like everyone of you have to live within a budget."

Answer to a question on entitlement spending and health care: "The two biggest reasons this, this ah, these ah entitlement costs are going up are two words: Medicare and Medicaid. They're growing at an exponentially fast rate, and anyone who will tell you that the government can control costs in health care if you just let us do it, look at Medicare and Medicaid. Medicaid over the past few years has grown at over 20 percent per year. Medicare has grown at over 14 percent a year. It is a joke to believe the federal government can control health care costs. They simply can't. Even, even the fact that those things are growing that fast, they still cost

deficit's lower under me', is because you've had a, you've had a, an economy that's been growing fairly well in the last, ah the last half of last year, and, and a little bit at the beginning of this year, and as a result less people on government program, more tax revenue being paid, therefore lower deficit. And so the key of getting the deficit down is controlling, number one, expanding the economy, and number two, controlling spending. It's a double, it's a, it's a, it -- you have to do both. What didn't happen during the Reagan years -- we, we cut taxes and increased economic activity. In fact, during the Reagan Administration, tax-, taxes, tax revenues increased 8 percent per year. Tax revenues, center of federal government increased 8 percent every year. The problem is tax spending, what we spend, increased 12 percent per year. Now inflation was running y'know 4, 5 percent during most of that time and even lower toward the end. So the idea that y'know the problem is with these tax cuts that we lost all this revenue, and that's why the deficit went up. Wrong. We cut taxes, revenues went up, and went up dramatically, but spending went up. So you have to do both: cut taxes to increase economic growth and therefore the federal revenue, number one. Number two, hold the line on spending. Don't spend more money, because we're getting more money in." Left out of this

huge cuts in spending on the economy. Many economists worry that cutting spending too much could stunt the present recovery.

Overview: RS was again preaching to the converted -- a group of about 40 Republican businessmen and a few businesswomen. He told them what they wanted to hear, preaching less government regulation and lower taxes. In the process, he attempted to tie HW to any politician that he thought the ensemble wouldn't like, including Robert Byrd as well as Bill Clinton. He was received well, but did not bring down the house. Fairly substantial media coverage.

well as Bill Clinton. He was received well, but did not bring down the house. Fairly substantial media coverage.

well as Bill Clinton. He was received well, but did not bring down the house. Fairly substantial media coverage.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: RS Welfare Reform Meeting
Location: Bristol Township
Municipal Building
Date: 04/09/94, 1:00 PM
Attendance: 15 people, mostly supporters
Media: Bucks County Courier Times (Jo ??)
Bristol Pilot (John King)

Comments:

RS was introduced by the Bucks County Chairman of his steering committee. She introduced him as a Congressional reformer and rising Republican. RS immediately launched into a quick version of his standard welfare speech.

The following are some interesting quotes and some deviations from the standard text:

For the first time, RS spent a good deal of time attacking welfare fraud. In true Reagan tradition, he related a story about a woman in Delaware County who received over 40 welfare checks a month. He praised attempts in New York State to use fingerprinting of welfare recipients to curtail fraud, ~~found an idea to provide a debit card with a~~ photograph for food stamp purchases. He finished by citing a GAO report, which he claimed found \$1 billion per year misspent or improperly given out under the welfare system, and \$2-3 billion lost to welfare fraud.

Attack on Senator Wofford as a bleeding-heart liberal who spends taxpayer money without requiring results: "And you'd say, well, let's put on our bleeding-heart liberal cap and since Senator Wofford is, is filming, ah that's his person back there filming this, I can, I can, ah I can try to relate to maybe the way Senator Wofford looks at this. He may say: 'Well, gee, y'know we need to help people. These people are sick and we should help them. Ah, y'know, they're addicted, and this is a problem, and we should help these people.' And I'd say 'Okay', well, le- let's do what folks like Senator Wofford don't do, which is look to see if it actually does help sick and we should help them. An, y'know, they're addicted, and this is a problem, and we should help these people.' And I'd say 'Okay', well, le- let's do what folks like Senator Wofford don't do, which is look to see if it actually does help anyone."

Outline of his work program: "What we do in this ~~work program is to~~ ~~After 2 months if you have not found a job we~~
Municipal Building

Date: 04/09/94, 1:00 PM
Attendance: 15 people, mostly supporters
Media: Bucks County Courier Times (Jo ??)
Bristol Pilot (John King)

Comments:

RS was introduced by the Bucks County Chairman of his steering committee. She introduced him as a Congressional reformer and rising Republican. RS immediately launched into a quick version of his standard welfare speech.

The following are some interesting quotes and some deviations from the standard text:

on this program, because you can do better if you get out of the program and actually work on a real job. So, we see this as sort of a deterrent, that in fact if you have this program here, more people will leave quicker, and that in fact i-, i-, I believe the program will be a failure if everybody ends up on these work programs. They must work 35 hours a week, and the state is required to provide those jobs for 3 years. After 3 years, the states can cut 'em off, and we don't have to provide any, any benefits at all after, after a total of 5 years in the program." I had not heard him discuss a final, 5-year cutoff before.

On work programs as a humane, productive tool to help people attain work skills and experience: "Well, let me just suggest this: there are a lot of people in this system, who simply, ah, particularly young, young ah girls who got into the system very early, before their education, before they got their education, before they ah acquired any skills, and, and probably have no job experience at all. This is at least an opportunity, because most of those folks have trouble finding any work, this is an opportunity to show they can work. This is an opportunity to show that they, ah they can get their act together and prove to, to their supervisor, whoever their employer is, whether it's the municipality or whether it's a business, ah that they can in fact do the job, and, and get references, and get ah, and get promoted, possibly even within the business."

During his discussion of the need to strengthen child support enforcement, RS got specific.. He claimed his bill gets the IRS involved in child support enforcement by requiring the report of child support payments on W-4 forms in order to get employment.

On cutting minors off from AFDC cash benefits to test conservative social theories: "Ah, number 5, we discourage illegitimacy, and that's very simple. Ah, what we say is that if, a, a child has a child, if you're a minor who has a child, we're no longer gonna give you cash assistance, you must live at home, and if you live at ho-, and you live at home you will receive medical care and food stamps, but we're no longer gonna pay 15 year-olds 5000 dollars a year to leave home and set up we're no longer gonna give you cash assistance as a financial incentive at home, and if you live at ho-, and you live at home you will receive medical care and food stamps, but we're no longer gonna pay 15 year-olds 5000 dollars a year to leave home and set up house, ah at, at that age, or, or to see a financial incentive at that age of having children. And we think that's a very strong message to a group of, to a group of people who we state is required to provide those jobs for 3 years. After 3 years, the states can cut 'em off, and we don't have to provide any, any benefits at all after, after a total of 5 years in the program." I had not heard him discuss a final, 5-year cutoff before.

On work programs as a humane, productive tool to help people attain work skills and experience: "Well, let me just suggest this: there are a lot of people in this system, who simply, ah, particularly young, young ah girls who got into the system very early, before their education, before they got their education, before they ah acquired any skills, and, and probably have no job experience at all. This is at least an opportunity, because most of those folks have trouble finding any work, this is an opportunity to show they can work. This is an opportunity to show that they, ah they can get their act

a great theory. I think that could have consequences that I think none of us want. And what we're trying to do here is really try a demonstration project, if you will. We'll just try it on a group of people who number 1, have some fallback, because they have families in which they live, so they're, they're not going to be out on their own, and number 2, try it on a group of people who end up in the system the longest. These are the chr-, the young people who have children are the chronically welfare dependent. What we need to do is focus our attention on them. If it works, then we can look about expanding that program." This quote can be hit in two possible ways. First, he once again flirts with saying that young women have children for monetary and personal gain. Second, he describes a program of cutting off benefits as a "demonstration project". This sounds pretty ruthless, especially if young women do not have a family to fall back on, or an abusive family. Young women and children will suffer while he demonstrates his pet project.

During his comparison of his welfare reform plan to President Clinton's, he claimed the President's plan will only put 2% of people to work, where he usually says 'about 5%'.

When asked if 'work programs' have a chance at passage if strong interest groups like unions oppose them, RS responded: "Yeah, unions will oppose it, there're a lot of people, publi-, public sector unions, I mean the private sector unions won't oppose it too much. Well, AFSCME opposes everything ah that, that's reformist-oriented, that has anything to do with government. Ah, and so, I mean that doesn't bother me, and I don't think it's bother-, I don't think it's gonna bother, it's gonna bother the liberals, guys like Wofford who don't, who never stand up to the unions no matter what their point. Ah, it'll bother them, and he won't support something like this, but, ah, in, what we believe is that, that there is a very clear and decisive call in this country ah to ah to stop the permanent welfare dependency. Ah that, not only from, from discussions I've had in these meetings, but I mean every poll I've looked at. It's just, it's the most amazing polling result that you, that I've seen in, in looking at polls in years. We got 95 percent of the people who agree with the ter-, time limit on welfare and a work requirement. 95 percent. I mean, I don't know, I don't know, I don't even know if 95 percent of the people in this in, in looking at polls in years. We got 95 percent of the people who agree with the ter-, time limit on welfare and a work requirement. 95 percent. I mean, I don't know, I don't know, I don't even know if 95 percent of the people in this country believe in God. I mean that's, that's how solid this idea is not going these things off the charts, and on a group of people who end up in the system the longest. These are the chr-, the young people who have children are the chronically welfare dependent. What we need to do is focus our attention on them. If it works, then we can look about expanding that program." This quote can be hit in two possible ways. First, he once again flirts with saying that young women have children for monetary and personal gain. Second, he describes a program of cutting off benefits as a "demonstration project". This sounds pretty ruthless, especially if young women do not have a family to fall back on, or an abusive family. Young women and children will suffer while he demonstrates his pet project.

During his comparison of his welfare reform plan to President Clinton's, he claimed the President's plan will only

the Balanced Budget Amendment vote. Third, it might be interesting to check out where RS got the 95% figure.

On what will happen if a mother doesn't know or doesn't tell the name of the father of her child: "If Mother doesn't give us the name, and she shows no visible means of support, then ah, then you do what, what you do in other, when, when you have children who are in non-supportive households, which is you take those children and put them in a supportive situation. That's what you do. Ah, it sounds tough, but someone's gotta start looking after these kids. I mean if, if, you, i-, all we do is put them back in homes that, that people don't take care of them. And if Mom is unwilling to, to cooperate and take care of these children, then at some point we have an obligation to protect these children. And it is false compassion to say that 'Well, y'know we just, y'know, we're gon-, we have to help these children and give them money', and give it to a Mom who is so irresponsible that she doesn't know the name of the father and doesn't want to do anything to support her children. Ah, that probably isn't gonna be a home that's gonna raise a child that's gonna be a very productive member of our society, and it's not the child's fault. Give the kid a chance." Once again, RS sounds a little ruthless especially at the beginning of the quote.

To a question on child care, RS claimed that there was money provided for child care in his bill. Specifically, he said an idea that would require most AFDC mothers to work, while a few would run day-care centers for all or the children.

On work programs: "They can work in a private sector or public sector. There's two programs out there. One's called the Community Work Experience Program, which is a public sector program. The other one's the Work Supplementation Program, which is a private sector program. So if ah, if your local business ah, ah needed someone who, to come in and, and, and, and to do some probably relatively low-skilled job in most of the cases of the people who are in these programs, ah that someone can come in and do it, it doesn't cost the employer anything. Ah, and the person can come in and work 35 hours a week. What we believe i-, y'know, if they do a good job, a lot of employers may in fact bring them on and hire them, and take them off the rolls..." Providing free employees to employers could be problematic. Companies could continually use free week. What we believe i-, y'know, if they do a good job, a lot of employers may in fact bring them on and hire them, and take them off the rolls..." Providing free employees to employers could be problematic. Companies could continually use free welfare workers for menial labor, thus shirking the responsibility of paying and providing benefits for low-skilled workers. Without careful supervision... rather, than, providing have children who are in non-supportive households, which is you take those children and put them in a supportive situation. That's what you do. Ah, it sounds tough, but someone's gotta start looking after these kids. I mean if, if, you, i-, all we do is put them back in homes that, that people don't take care of them. And if Mom is unwilling to, to cooperate and take care of these children, then at some point we have an obligation to protect these children. And it is false compassion to say that 'Well, y'know we just, y'know, we're gon-, we have to help these children and give them money', and give it to a Mom who is so irresponsible that she doesn't know the name of the father and doesn't want to do anything to support her children. Ah, that probably isn't gonna be a home that's gonna raise a child that's gonna be a very productive

very hopeful that it won't be the Clinton plan, or the Wofford plan. Ah, Senator Wofford was quoted in Altoona, and I can't believe you did this Senator, but ah, he was quoted in Altoona as saying that the Clinton plan is over-regulatory and bureaucratic. Ah, and so now he's beginning to distance himself, as he does with everything, I mean he just hops all over the place -- Senator Waffle -- he just hops all over the place on these things. Ah, he's in Central Pennsylvania so he has to talk like a conservative. Ah, and he came out and said 'What we really need to do is my bill' which is a lot more simple, it's only 87 pages or something like that. He said, well-. His bill is Senator Daschle's bill, ah which he is a cosp--, cosigner of, ah, and his bill is simple: it's a Canadian system. You turn it over to the federal government. It's a single-payer system. Yea, it's simple, the government does everything. Ah, yeah, we can do, we can, we can make everything very simple, Senator, if we just, if we all go out and work and pay everything to the government, and the government just does everything for us. Why don't we just do that? Ah, so, I mean, there, there is a simplicity in having the government doing everything for us, but it doesn't necessarily lead to a society that ah, that rewards the kind of responsible behavior that we want to encourage in this country." As we discussed, RS is off base with these comments.

Overview: This was a short meeting, but RS issued some statements. I think he is getting used to having a camera at the events and dropping his guard a bit. Worth thinking about is whether we should save attacks on his misstatements until we have built up a good list of them. If we use these statements too early, he may get cautious rather than continue to feel more relaxed.

himself, as he does with everything, I mean he just hops all over the place -- Senator Waffle -- he just hops all over the place on these things. Ah, he's in Central Pennsylvania so he has to talk like a conservative. Ah, and he came out and said 'What we really need to do is my bill' which is a lot more simple, it's only 87 pages or something like that. He said, well-. His bill is Senator Daschle's bill, ah which he is a cosp--, cosigner of, ah, and his bill is simple: it's a Canadian system. You turn it over to the federal government. It's a single-payer system. Yea, it's simple, the government does everything. Ah, yeah, we can do, we can, we can make everything very simple, Senator, if we just, if we all go out and work and pay everything to the government, and the government just does everything for us. Why don't we just do that? Ah, so, I mean, there, there is a simplicity in having

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CUTS

Q "How much could the budgets of the House and Senate be cut without it hurting the country one little bit?"

A "I've proposed in the past 20 percent reductions, which I think we could absorb easily in budgets, not only personal budgets, but more importantly committee staffs.

"I mean if you look at the personal staffs of Members, I think we could probably do with some cuts there. But that's not really where all the money is spent. It's on what are called legislative service organizations and committee staffs where you have literally hundreds of people working on these committee staffs whose job it is to find a reason to justify their existence.

"I think one of the reasons we get diverted off into so many different directions is because we pay people to do that for us. I think we could have a substantial reduction in committee staffs. We've suggested upwards of 40 percent which would, I think, put the government back on the kind of footing which it should be."

-- RS Interview, Greensburg Tribune-Democrat, 04/10/94

A "I've proposed in the past 20 percent reductions, which I think we could absorb easily in budgets, not only personal budgets, but more importantly committee staffs.

"I mean if you look at the personal staffs of Members, I think we could probably do with some cuts there. But that's not really where all the money is spent. It's on what are called legislative service organizations and committee staffs where you have literally hundreds of people working on these committee staffs whose job it is to find a reason to justify their existence.

"I think one of the reasons we get diverted off into so many different directions is because we pay people to do that for us. I think we could have a substantial reduction in committee staffs. We've suggested upwards of 40 percent which would, I

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Re: Republican Campaign Rally
Location: Philadelphia
Paulombo's
824 Catherine Street
Date: 04/11/94, 8:00 PM
Attendance: 200 Republicans, many County Committee people
Media: Elaine Entzminger, Channel 29
Mike Reno, Philadelphia Exclusive
John Morgan, Philadelphia Navy Yard
Unwilling to give name, Channel 6 (ABC)

Comments:

The Philadelphia County Republican Committee Chairman introduced Tom Ridge first to a standing ovation. The band played 'As the Saints Came Marching In'. They danced around until the song ended. He then gave a well-received speech, concentrating on being tough on crime, restoring PA pride, and making the government friendlier to businesses and job creators. He then introduced Schweiker, the endorsed Lt. Gov. candidate, who spoke of family values, crime, and pride.

He then introduced RS as the best and the brightest in America, a first-rate example of the Republican future.

He made one attack on HW and a plug for his and RS's health care plan: "I remember when Harris Wofford ran for the Senate in the special election. Remember: 'Every criminal got a lawyer, and every sick person got a doctor' (scattered laughter). But what he didn't tell us was that the government was going to get to pick this doctor. What he didn't tell us was that he was going to support a plan written by Bill Clinton, so that when my Momma gets sick, she ends up talking to a bureaucrat and not a doctor. Well, let me tell you, in a debate where everybody has got some bottom line, my bottom line is that we are not going to adopt a health care bill that takes away from you your right to pick your doctor. (applause)

"Under the Clinton bill, that is supported by your debate where everybody has got some bottom line, my bottom line is that we are not going to adopt a health care bill that takes away from you your right to pick your doctor. (applause)

"Under the Clinton bill, that is supported by your debate where everybody has got some bottom line, my bottom line is that we are not going to adopt a health care bill that takes away from you your right to pick your doctor. (applause)

"Under the Clinton bill, that is supported by your Democratic incumbent Senator, your private health insurance is going to be canceled. You're going to be forced to buy health care through a government collective, and if a private insurance company tries to sell you insurance, in competition with the government, they're going to have imposed on them a 10,000 dollar fine. What kind of freedom of choice is that? I reject that idea. Rick Santorum and I (drowned out by applause).

"Rick Santorum and I want to make health insurance portable, so you can change jobs without losing your health insurance. We want to make it permanent, so if you get sick

the insurance company can't cancel your health insurance. We want to help people with pre-existing conditions get and keep good private health insurance. We want to reform medical liability so that somebody sues your hospital and they lose the lawsuit, they gotta pay the hospital's cost of defending itself. We want to reform Medicaid. Something is wrong in America, when if you don't work you get Medicaid and you got health insurance, but if you do work and you make a modest income, you often don't have private health insurance (applause). I don't understand a country who treats people who are riding in the wagon better than it treats people who are pulling it. And Rick Santorum and I want to change that." Here Gramm admits that many working Americans don't have insurance -- something RS is not always willing to do.

Gramm then spoke about Balance Budget Amendment. He promised that if a Republican majority is elected in the Senate, the R's would bring up and adopt a B.B.A. the first day of the next Congressional session. He then championed tough crime measures, and introduced Rick Santorum.

He began by complimenting the county, city, and ward leaders as the people who make a difference in getting Republican candidates elected. RS told stories and talked about his first election and the people who made the difference.

He discussed his roots -- his father and grandfather were immigrants, his grandfather worked in the coal mines of Central PA and died of black lung, the train tracks went through the front yard of his father's house. "Why did they come to this country? Did they come to this country because America was the land of security, of the Health Security Act? No. They came to this country, 'cause America's the land of opportunity, where if you worked hard, played by the rules, you can live your dreams. You can live your dreams. What's happening to that country? What's happening to that country is we have people like Harris Wofford and Bill Clinton who want to take more from you, to give to them, for them to make decisions about you -- about what doctor you want to go to, about what hospital you can go to, about who you can go to see to provide whatever care you want. Is that the kind of country you want to live in? (Crowd: No) Y'know we can do something about that. You want to go to the hospital you can go to, about who you can go to see to provide whatever care you want. Is that the kind of country you want to live in? (Crowd: No) Y'know we can do something about that.

"This Senate race in Pennsylvania is gonna be the biggest Senate race in the country. Why? I'll give you a America, when if you don't work you get Medicaid and you got health insurance, but if you do work and you make a modest income, you often don't have private health insurance (applause). I don't understand a country who treats people who are riding in the wagon better than it treats people who are pulling it. And Rick Santorum and I want to change that." Here Gramm admits that many working Americans don't have insurance -- something RS is not always willing to do.

Gramm then spoke about Balance Budget Amendment. He promised that if a Republican majority is elected in the Senate, the R's would bring up and adopt a B.B.A. the first day of the next Congressional session. He then championed tough crime measures, and introduced Rick Santorum.

He began by complimenting the county, city, and ward

here. The poster child of the Clinton presidency, Harris Wofford is up for reelection. (Laughter and applause)

"We have a tremendous opportunity, we have a tremendous opportunity to send that message, strong message, to Washington, DC and to the country. ..."

RS goes on to say that Republicans in Pennsylvania can send a strong message to Washington and the nation on health care, as HW carries the banner of the Clinton health care plan. Also can affect tax issues, welfare reform, etc.. Goes on to compliment the assembled as able to make a difference. Then launches into an attack on HW and a implied comparison between himself and John Heinz. Earlier he had pointed out that he cut his political teeth working on the 1976 Heinz Senate election, and represents the same Congressional seat Heinz represented. Now he tried to assume the Heinz's ideological, Republican mantle/legacy:

"You deserve a Senator who's willing to go out and work for you, who remembers that he represents the people of Pennsylvania not the Democratic or Republican party in Washington, DC. You see, I want to work for you. I represent you. I work for you. You're my employers. (Applause) I want to go out there every day to earn my salary. I want to earn my salary by rolling up sleeves and working in your community. I'm gonna be accessible to you, I'm gonna be out in your neighborhood. I'm gonna be fighting, whether it's as I did in

my home state of Pennsylvania, with Herman Rice who I know is here from Philadelphia, and walk through the streets, chasing the drug addicts off the corner, and the d-, and the people dealing drugs. I'll be here, because you deserve (applause). You deserve a Senator who's willing to put the energy in and the faith into your community that you put in. You're here because you're leaders in your community, because you care about your community. The least you can expect is someone to care as much as you do who's running for the United States Senate. We haven't had that; we've lost that. We lost that in 1991, in April of 1991, almost 3 years ago to the day we lost that. We have an opportunity to get it back. We have an opportunity to get it back and in the process send the message to shake 'em all up.

"Everyone in this room, you get up in the morning, you look in the mirror, you're looking at the face who bears the back. We have an opportunity to get it back and in the process send the message to shake 'em all up.

"Everyone in this room, you get up in the morning, you look in the mirror, you're looking at the face who bears the back. We have an opportunity to get it back and in the process send the message to shake 'em all up.

"Everyone in this room, you get up in the morning, you look in the mirror, you're looking at the face who bears the moral responsibility, the moral responsibility th-, that our country is free and safe and prosperous. I'm not asking you to stand in front of a tank in Tiananmen Square, or to lock arms in front of the White House in Moscow to make sure that the tanks don't crash through. But what you do in this election is every bit as important to the future of freedom, democracy, security, and opportunity in America. Do it for your kids. Do it for your grand-kids. Do it for your country. God bless you. (Standing ovation)"

Overview: RS did not speak for too long, shorter than Tom Ridge. Most of what he said is transcribed above. His

message was pretty good -- these Republicans seemed excited about sending Bill Clinton a message. They also seemed enthralled by Heinz's legacy. I think it's important that we emphasize that RS in no way stands for the same ideas and ideology as John Heinz. People liked his speech, but he didn't bring down the house. Nor did Ridge, but people still seemed more into him. All in all, it was an interesting event.

The counter-rallies outside seemed to be a success. The PURE duo handed out 70 packets, including to a few members of the press. They also enjoyed themselves and seem like a good couple of guys. One of them, John Paone, is graduating from Villanova in a month. He wants a job, badly. He is willing to do anything and appears to be fired up and hard working. He might be a good field worker. I'll discuss my reservations at a later time. The health care demonstration looked good when I walked in. There were about 10-12 students, seniors, and 1 family milling around holding signs and passing out leaflets. Apparently, they passed out all 200 leaflets I copied for them. I have not spoken to anyone who was there -- many had to leave before the event ended. I think it went pretty well.

bring down the house. Nor did Ridge, but people still seemed more into him. All in all, it was an interesting event.

The counter-rallies outside seemed to be a success. The PURE duo handed out 70 packets, including to a few members of the press. They also enjoyed themselves and seem like a good couple of guys. One of them, John Paone, is graduating from Villanova in a month. He wants a job, badly. He is willing to do anything and appears to be fired up and hard working. He might be a good field worker. I'll discuss my reservations at a later time. The health care demonstration looked good when I walked in. There were about 10-12 students, seniors, and 1 family milling around holding signs and passing out leaflets. Apparently, they passed out all 200 leaflets I copied for them. I have not spoken to anyone who was there -- many had to leave before the event ended. I think it went

MEMO

To: Stuart
 From: Marshall
 Date: 06/30
 Re: RS W&M Statements

RS made 2 statements today about the Clinton Plan and the Republican Substitute Amendment, and asked 1 question. The statements were as follows:

1) During debate on the Clinton plan:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kleczka just said a few minutes ago that the insurance industry should base their criticisms of what's going on in this body based on honesty, that they should come forward with the truth to the American public. I would suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he should start talking to some of his colleagues about honesty with respect to what's in this bill, before he starts lecturing people outside the Congress about what, what's honesty.

"Number 1, Mr. Levin says that there is quote more choice in this bill than under the current system. I don't know about you, but I think that the government dictating a single benefit package on every American where today Americans can choose their benefit package is not more choice. I think dramatically limiting the access to the provision of your choice is a choice than under the current law.

"Mr. Levin also said that there are no general taxes in this bill. Now, I've heard this all this week and last week: 'there are no general taxes in this bill'. I assume that you believe that the FICA tax, Social Security tax is not a general tax, because this is, this is identical to a payroll. This is a tax on every person working in America. It's either a tax paid to the Federal Government, or it's a requirement that the employer pay a certain amount of money to an insurance company. It is a payroll tax. It is a tax on every working American, and you continue to say it's not a general tax. Yes, people who don't work don't have to pay the tax. But people who don't work don't have to pay income tax. They don't have to pay Social Security taxes, and if you don't think they're general taxes, I don't know what a general tax is. So let's talk about honesty. This is a general tax to fund this bill. But people who don't work don't have to pay income tax. They don't have to pay Social Security taxes, and if you don't think they're general taxes, I don't know what a general tax is. So let's talk about honesty. This is a general tax to fund this bill. But people who don't work don't have to pay income tax. They don't have to pay Social Security taxes, and if you don't think they're general taxes, I don't know what a general tax is. So let's talk about honesty. This is a general tax to fund this bill.

"Mr. Kopetski says that this system builds on the current system. The current system, the, the problem we're trying to address is twofold: access and cost. Let's talk about access. The current system is voluntary, this system is mandatory. That's building on the current system? Let's talk about cost. The first is the current system is private-sector cost control, this is public-sector cost control. That's building on the current system? Let's talk about honesty in presenting what this bill really does.

"Mr. Gibbons yesterday said that 78 percent of the people in

this country just polled like what we're doing here, want this bill. In the very same survey, by the way the, the poll says that 78 percent want something to be done on health care, not that they like this bill, and in fact the survey said that 55 percent of the people in that poll oppose the President's plan. Let's talk about honesty in presenting what's in this bill, what this Committee is doing, and then maybe we can talk about criticizing the industry for their honesty. Thank you."

Gibbons: "Y'know, Mr. Santorum, it's very unchairmanlike to have to interject on my behalf, but you made some statements that are just utterly incorrect, and I think I must correct them, so that the people who are listening to this will have the correct information. This bill provides in the 1st Title, I know we took that up along time ago and perhaps the gentleman has forgotten, but this provides that Americans can spend their money on anything they want to about health care. It just merely provides that every American will have a certain basic set of health care benefits, but they can buy anything else they want to.

"2, choice. Every American can choose whatever doctor they want to, unless they take a less expensive model of health care which, in which they would have to go to the doctor that the insurance company assigns them to. That's what they voted for.

I want to read to you again the Washington Post/ABC polls. Question: 'Do you support a system providing universal coverage for all Americans?'; 78 percent answered on June 26 that they supported that. 2nd Question: 'Federal price controls on medical

prices'; 75 percent of the people who responded to that poll of over 3000 people voted for that. The 3rd question: 'A federal law requiring all employers to provide health insurance to their full-time employees; 72 percent of all those 3000 Americans who responded to that poll -- there's 2 polls in here -- but 72 percent of the people responded favorably to that question.

So, y'know, I don't mind a debate here, but let's try to stick to the facts."

2) During debate on the Republican Substitute Amendment, RS took issue with Rep. Levin's statement that the Chairman's Mark does not impose a general tax:

RS: "Your charging of employers a, a tax is not a general tax? You're saying that -- what you're suggesting require employers to not impose a general tax: of the payroll, requires employers to

RS: "Your charging of employers a, a tax is not a general tax? You're saying that -- what you're suggesting require employers to pay a certain percentage of the payroll, requires employers to pay money to the Internal Revenue Service on every employee is not a general tax?"

criticizing the industry for their honesty. Thank you."

Gibbons: "Y'know, Mr. Santorum, it's very unchairmanlike to have to interject on my behalf, but you made some statements that are just utterly incorrect, and I think I must correct them, so that the people who are listening to this will have the correct information. This bill provides in the 1st Title, I know we took that up along time ago and perhaps the gentleman has forgotten, but this provides that Americans can spend their money on anything they want to about health care. It just merely provides that every American will have a certain basic set of health care benefits, but they can buy anything else they want to.

"2, choice. Every American can choose whatever doctor they want to, unless they take a less expensive model of health care which, in which they would have to go to the doctor that the

employee who really pays.

RS: "And I agree."

Levin: "But then you'd agree that it isn't a tax."

RS: "It's not? The federal government requires someone to pay something to the Internal Revenue Service, and it's not a tax."

Levin: "The answer is most employees in this country have bargained for coverage through their employer."

RS: "Not what you're suggesting."

Levin: "Most employees receive their benefits this way, and what we're spreading is the way that the American system has been built through private employment. It is not a general tax period."

3) After Nancy Johnson gave her endorsement of the Republican substitute, RS spoke again:

RS: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlelady from Connecticut, who has done one outstanding job ah in this ah, in this Committee. She has dedicated herself to ah to this issue like no-one else, and is truly an outstanding representative ah of, of our Caucus in leading this charge, and she articulated it better than ah, than I've heard. I, I note that her articulation, and with the other speakers on this side of the aisle and yesterday at the ah confer-, press conference over in the Senate where the Republicans introduced their bill, a ah note of enthusiasm and a true ah vigor in advocating this position which I frankly think has been missing. We have something to be very, very proud of in what we've put forward. We have something that is truly an American to, to this problem that truly does build on the current system instead of replacing the current system. And I, I welcome this kind of debate, and I hope that the members of media who are sitting out there, who simply fail to report about Republican ideas and solutions start giving this the kind of credibility it deserves, and quit passing off Republicans as patchwork, and look at the comprehensiveness of the members of media who are sitting out there, who simply fail to report about Republican ideas and solutions start giving this the kind of credibility it deserves, and quit passing off Republicans as patchwork, and look at the comprehensiveness of what's being put forward, and what is ah, what is, I think the best ah, the best way to solve this problem, and I believe the pay something to the Internal Revenue Service, and it's not a tax."

Levin: "The answer is most employees in this country have bargained for coverage through their employer."

RS: "Not what you're suggesting."

Levin: "Most employees receive their benefits this way, and what we're spreading is the way that the American system has been built through private employment. It is not a general tax period."

3) After Nancy Johnson gave her endorsement of the Republican

public.

"Ah, Mr. Levin, I, I just am in constant amazement of how in this body, we tend, we tend to follow the rule that James Carville set out during the 1992 Presidential campaign, that if you tell a lie enough, and you keep repeating it over and over and over again, eventually people will believe it. So if you tell people enough that when you, when you, when the Federal Government requires the someone to write a check to the Internal Revenue Service that it isn't a tax, if you keep telling people that that's not a tax, and you say it over and over and over and over again, and you're in the majority so you control things, then they'll believe you. Mr. Levin, they're not gonna believe you. They are not gonna believe that this is not a tax. They know this is a tax. You can call it what you want. You can call it -- what is it -- individual and employer responsibility. That's a wonderful euphemism in this section of the bill. When you talk about employer taxes, now you call it responsibility. It's not responsibility, it's a federal tax. It's a payroll tax on every working American. Now, let's come clean. That's what you folks are doing. It is a general tax, as much as an income tax is, as much as a FICA tax, a Social Security tax is. It is a tax. Please, if we're gonna have an honest discussion, quit pulling the wool over the people's eyes as to what you're doing here. What we're doing here is imposing a massive general tax to pay for a government system -- Medicare Part C -- a government system that you are imposing on this ah -- I'll even go CBO: 'Premium payments should be shown as governmental receipts' -- Congressional Budget Office.

Final point that I want to make, and that's the point that Mrs. Johnson was getting at, and that's the difference that we will have, continue to hear between universal coverage and universal access. This is another debate over nomenclature which has very little to do with substance. What is the substance of what we're trying to accomplish. We are trying to get as many people insured as possible in America. That's our objective on this side of the aisle, that's the objective on the other side of the aisle. Everybody wants to get everybody insured.

market. The question is how do we do it. Neither party, neither solution -- universal coverage, universal access -- gets everybody into the system. Mrs. Clinton sat in that chair right there 8 months ago, 9 months ago in September, and said that under her plan 3 to 4 percent would still be uninsured. Sat right there and said that to the Committee. The Canadian system doesn't insure every Canadian. There's about 3 percent uninsured rate in Canada. There isn't a system in the world that covers everybody, because there will always be people who fall through the cracks. In our great state of Pennsylvania, we have about 1 percent of our population is Amish. Now, we can't insure them. We shouldn't make them be insured. There will always be people who are homeless, who will not be insured. What is our goal? It's to get as many people as humanly possible in the system. And the question is how do you do it?

"What they suggest is that the government should decide what is best for you, and mandate that you participate in their

"What they suggest is that the government should decide what is best for you, and mandate that you participate in their

again, and you're in the majority so you control things, then they'll believe you. Mr. Levin, they're not gonna believe you. They are not gonna believe that this is not a tax. They know this is a tax. You can call it what you want. You can call it -- what is it -- individual and employer responsibility. That's a wonderful euphemism in this section of the bill. When you talk about employer taxes, now you call it responsibility. It's not responsibility, it's a federal tax. It's a payroll tax on every working American. Now, let's come clean. That's what you folks are doing. It is a general tax, as much as an income tax is, as much as a FICA tax, a Social Security tax is. It is a tax. Please, if we're gonna have an honest discussion, quit pulling the wool over the people's eyes as to what you're doing here. What we're doing here is imposing a massive general tax to pay for a government system -- Medicare Part C -- a government system that you are imposing on this ah -- I'll even go CBO: 'Premium payments should be shown as governmental receipts' -- Congressional Budget Office.

Final point that I want to make, and that's the point that Mrs. Johnson was getting at, and that's the difference that we

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Marshall
Date: 07/01
Re: Key Ways & Means Votes

Comments:

1) Grandy Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike Title II altogether, thus eliminating the employer mandate (the amendment was defeated in subcommittee 6 to 5). Rejected 18-20, (R 14-0, D 4-20), [Jacobs, IN; Andrews, TX; Payne, VA; and Brewster, OK voted yea]. RS Yea. 06/14/94.

2) Thomas Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to amend Title II, Individual and Employer Responsibilities, to drop employer and individual mandates and replace them with a mandate for employers to offer, but not necessarily pay for, health insurance for all employees. Rejected 18-20, (R 14-0, D 4-20), [Jacobs, IN; Andrews, TX; Payne, VA; and Brewster, OK voted yea]. RS Yea. 06/15/94.

~~By Jefferson Amendment to the Chairman's Mark~~ - to establish a small business credit, to reduce the mark's tobacco tax increase, and to replace the additional 1% insurance premium tax with a temporary, 5-yr. 1% tax. The amendment was divided for votes by the Republicans into its separate parts:

a) Jefferson Amendment, Small Business Credit - to establish a two-tiered credit for small business. For firms with 25 or fewer employees, the maximum credit would be 50%; for employers with 26-50 employees, the maximum credit would be 37.5%. Approved 24-14, (R 0-14, D 24-0). RS Nay. 06/16/94.

b) Jefferson Amendment, Tobacco Tax - to increase the tobacco tax by \$.15 in '95 and '96, \$.25 in '97, \$.35 in '98, and \$.45 in '99 and thereafter. [The Chairman's mark would increase the tax to \$.60 in '99 and thereafter]. Approved 24-14, (R 0-14, D 24-0).

b) Jefferson Amendment, Tobacco Tax - to increase the tobacco tax by \$.15 in '95 and '96, \$.25 in '97, \$.35 in '98, and \$.45 in '99 and thereafter. [The Chairman's mark would increase the tax to \$.60 in '99 and thereafter]. Approved 24-14, (R 0-14, D 24-0). RS Nay. 06/16/94.

Re: Key Ways & Means Votes

Comments:

1) Grandy Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike Title II altogether, thus eliminating the employer mandate (the amendment was defeated in subcommittee 6 to 5). Rejected 18-20, (R 14-0, D 4-20), [Jacobs, IN; Andrews, TX; Payne, VA; and Brewster, OK voted yea]. RS Yea. 06/14/94.

2) Thomas Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to amend Title II, Individual and Employer Responsibilities, to drop employer and individual mandates and replace them with a mandate

6) Archer amendment to the Neal Substitute Amendment to the Houghton Amendment - to reduce the self-insurance limit from companies with 250 or more employees to companies with 1 or more employee. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 24-0). **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

7) Houghton Amendment to the Neal Substitute Amendment to the Houghton Amendment - to insure that his self-insurance limit reduction to companies with 50 or more employees was voted on, Houghton introduced this amendment to the Neal substitute. Rejected 16-22, (R 14-0, D 2-22), [Hoagland (D-NE) and Brewster (D-OK) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

8) Neal Substitute Amendment to the Houghton Amendment - to reduce the self-insurance limit from companies with 250 or more employees to those with 100 or more. Approved 36-2, (R 14-0, D 22-2), [Stark, McDermott voted Nay]. **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

9) Thomas Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to: 1) strike instances in bill giving the Sec. of HHS the authority to overturn unilaterally the use of off-label drugs, 2) keep intact medically accepted indication of off-label abuse. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/21/94.

10) Jacobs Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to add Medical Savings Accounts as an additional option for employers to offer. Passed by Voice Vote. 06/22/94. **RS Statement.**

11) Santorum Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike the provision for advance approval of outpatient prescription drugs. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/22/94. **RS Statement.**

12) Santorum Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to sunset the OBRA '93 Vaccine Programs. Rejected 15-22, (R 14-0, D 1-22), [Brewster, (D-OK), Hoagland (D-NE) Did not vote]. **RS Yea.** 06/22/94. **RS Statement.**

13) Klecza (D-WI) Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to allow private health plans to decide whether or not to include abortion services in the benefit package. Rejected 5-33, (R 2-12, D 3-21), [Klecza, Neal (D-MA), Brewster (D-OK), Shaw (R-FL), Houghton (R-NY) voted Yea]. **RS Nay.** 06/22/94.

14) Bunning Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to exclude abortion from the benefit package. Rejected 15-23, (R 11-3, D 4-20), [Thomas (R-CA), Johnson (R-CT), Houghton (R-NY) voted Nay, 14-0, D 2-22], [Hoagland (D-NE) and Brewster (D-OK) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

14) Bunning Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to exclude abortion from the benefit package, except in the case of rape, incest, or physical danger to the mother. Rejected 15-23, (R 11-3, D 4-20), [Thomas (R-CA), Johnson (R-CT), Houghton (R-NY) voted Nay, 14-0, D 2-22], [Hoagland (D-NE) and Brewster (D-OK) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

8) Neal Substitute Amendment to the Houghton Amendment - to reduce the self-insurance limit from companies with 250 or more employees to those with 100 or more. Approved 36-2, (R 14-0, D 22-2), [Stark, McDermott voted Nay]. **RS Yea.** 06/17/94.

9) Thomas Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to: 1) strike instances in bill giving the Sec. of HHS the authority to overturn unilaterally the use of off-label drugs, 2) keep intact medically accepted indication of off-label abuse. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/21/94.

10) Jacobs Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to add Medical Savings Accounts as an

(after extensive debate, including the above RS statement) Rejected 16-22, (R 14-0, D 2-22), [Andrews (D-TX) and Hoagland (D-NE) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/23/94.

17) Jefferson Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to allow "any willing provider" to participate in a HMO. (after much debate) Approved 20-17 (R 6-7, D 14-10), [Rostenkowski (D-IL), Pickle (D-TX), Matsui (D-CA), Kennelly (D-CT), Andrews (D-TX), Levin (D-MI), Cardin (D-MD), Lewis (D-GA), Payne (D-VA), Neal (D-MA), Hoagland (D-NE) voted Nay; Archer (R-TX), Crane (R-IL), Shaw (R-FL), McCrery (R-LA), RS, Camp (R-MI) voted Yea; Sundquist (R-TN) Did not vote]. **RS Yea.** 06/23/94.

18) Grandy Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to permit associations to be formed for the purposes of buying health insurance. [In the mark, associations are permitted to purchase health insurance for their members, providing they include __ members, and were formed for other purposes than the purchasing of insurance.] Rejected 14-23, (R 14-0, D 0-23), [Ford (D-TN) Did not vote]. **RS Yea.** 06/23/94.

19) Johnson Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to provide for modified community ratings by age, in addition to the already allowed modification of geographic location (Amendment attached). Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/24/94. **RS Statement.**

20) Camp Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to allow associations of more than 1000 members or 200 businesses to experience rate (Amendment attached). Rejected 17-21, (R 14-0, D 3-21), [Pickle (D-TX), Brewster (D-OK), Hoagland (D-NE) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/24/94.

21) Thomas Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike Medicare Part C, and allow states to purchase private coverage for Medicaid beneficiaries. Rejected 16-22, (R 14-0, D 2-22), [Andrews (D-TX) and Hoagland (D-NE) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/25/94.

22) Santorum Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike classes of health care services and allocation of the Medicare estimate by class of service; and to strike allocation of health spending to states. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/25/94.

~~22) Shaw Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike Title VIII, Subtitles C & D, Cost Containment in Medicare and Additional Medicare Savings (Amendment attached). Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/25/94.~~

and allocation of the Medicare estimate by class of service; and to strike allocation of health spending to states. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/25/94.

23) Shaw Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike Title VIII, Subtitles C & D, Cost Containment in Medicare and Additional Medicare Savings (Amendment attached). Rejected 15-23, (R 14-0, D 1-23), [Hoagland (D-NE) voted Yea]. **RS Yea.** 06/25/94.

24) McCrery Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike mandatory nonforfeiture coverage in favor of optional nonforfeiture benefits. Rejected 18-20, (R 14-0, D 4-20). **RS Yea.** 06/27/94.

25) Andrews Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to eliminate private sector cost controls

would not apply in a state unless the majority of the voters in the state by public referendum approve the application of such rates. Rejected 14-24, (R 14-0, D 0-24). **RS Yea.** 06/28/94.

27) Andrews Amendment to the Chairman's Mark (as amended by the 06/16 Jefferson Amendment) - to rise cigarette taxes up to \$1.25 per pack; to create a Tobacco Farmer Relief Fund; to fund HHS health education programs; to restore funding for long term care starting in 1997 delayed by the 06/16 Jefferson Amendment; and to use remainder of revenue from tax increase to support Medicare payments for inpatient hospital care due to tobacco related illness. Rejected 7-31, (R 1-13, D 6-18), [Jacobs (D-IN), Ford (D-TN), Andrews (D-TX), McDermott (D-WA), Lewis (D-GA), Cardin (D-MD), Johnson (R-CT) voted Yea]. **RS Nay.** 06/29/94.

28) Bunning Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike the bill's increase of tobacco taxes. Rejected 12-26, (R 11-3, D 1-23), [Payne (D-VA) voted Yea; Shaw (R-FL), Johnson (R-CT), Houghton (R-NY) voted Nay]. **RS Yea.** 06/29/94.

29) Grandy Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to provide for an immediate 100% deduction for insurance premiums for the self-employed, paid for by taxing Workers' Compensation income. Rejected 13-25, (R 11-3, D 2-22), [McNulty (D-NY) and Brewster (D-OK) voted Yea; Herger (R-CA), [unclear] (D-IL), and Hancock (R-MO) voted Nay]. **RS Yea.** 06/29/94.

30) Thomas introduction of the Clinton plan. Rejected 1-17, 19 Present, 1 Did not vote. (Impossible to tell exactly how everyone voted, because they all changed their votes, some more than once). **RS Pass, changed to Nay.** 06/30/94.

31) McDermott Substitute Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to substitute McDermott's single-payer plan (HR 1200) for the Chairman's Mark. Rejected 9-29, (R 0-14, D 9-15), [Stark (D-CA), Rangel (D-NY), Ford (D-TN), Coyne (D-PA), McDermott (D-WA), Lewis (D-GA), Rostenkowski (D-IL), Kleczka (D-WI), Reynolds (D-IL) voted Yea]. **RS Nay.** 06/30/94.

[Stark (D-CA), Rangel (D-NY), Ford (D-TN), [unclear] (D-PA), [unclear] (D-WA), Lewis (D-GA), Rostenkowski (D-IL), Kleczka (D-WI), Reynolds (D-IL) voted Yea]. **RS Nay.** 06/30/94.

32) Archer/Thomas Substitute Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to substitute a ~~27) Andrews' Amendment to the Chairman's Mark (as amended by the 06/16 Jefferson Amendment)~~ ^{Repealed} - to rise cigarette taxes up to \$1.25 per pack; to create a Tobacco Farmer Relief Fund; to fund HHS health education programs; to restore funding for long term care starting in 1997 delayed by the 06/16 Jefferson Amendment; and to use remainder of revenue from tax increase to support Medicare payments for inpatient hospital care due to tobacco related illness. Rejected 7-31, (R 1-13, D 6-18), [Jacobs (D-IN), Ford (D-TN), Andrews (D-TX), McDermott (D-WA), Lewis (D-GA), Cardin (D-MD), Johnson (R-CT) voted Yea]. **RS Nay.** 06/29/94.

28) Bunning Amendment to the Chairman's Mark - to strike the bill's increase of tobacco taxes. Rejected 12-26, (R 11-3, D 1-23), [Payne (D-VA) voted Yea; Shaw (R-FL), Johnson (R-CT), Houghton (R-NY) voted Nay]. **RS Yea.** 06/29/94.

MEMO

TO: STU
 FROM: TIM
 DATE: 24 August 1994
 LOCATION: Pittsburgh, Wm. Penn Hotel, Rotary Club Meeting
 MENTA: None
 CROWD DESCRIPTION: Mostly Republicans, Mostly older white men

It [the Crime Bill] passed by a fairly competitive margin. I did not vote for it. I would not vote for it again...I don't think it would do anything to improve the crime situation in the country.

RS referred to the bill as an "overblown piece of legislation."

Four percent of all crimes committed in this country are federal crimes. And most of them aren't what you're afraid of. I mean,

crimes- high seas crimes on the high seas- Most of the crimes are of the garden variety crimes that you're afraid of when you walk out of your house or parking garage late at night. Those are the state and local crimes, and the federal government, frankly, doesn't have much to say about those crimes. But what we do do, what we can say, what we can do is try to assist state and local government.

What we can do, what we should have done is the two major things, two procedural things that we could do to dramatically help: law enforcement on the one side, and what I think sends a strong signal, is punishment on the other side.

RS suggested that the Crime Bill needs provisions that prevents enforcement on the one side; ~~adherence of Constitutional~~ signal, is punishment on the other side.

RS suggested that the Crime Bill needs provisions that prevents criminals from getting released because of Constitutional technicalities. He also touched on a need to reform the Habeas Corpus law.

MEMO

TO: STU
 FROM: TIM
 DATE: 24 August 1994
 LOCATION: Pittsburgh, Wm. Penn Hotel, Rotary Club Meeting
 MENTA: None
 CROWD DESCRIPTION: Mostly Republicans, Mostly older white men

It [the Crime Bill] passed by a fairly competitive margin. I did not vote for it. I would not vote for it again...I don't think it would do anything to improve the crime situation in the country.

the freedom, but it's there. Our founders put it there. You may not like it, but it's there. Now, I swear- I was sworn into

Aug. 24 '94 21:24

F10

P. 3

office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution is very specific.

The NRA supports me, and I'm happy to have them.

office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution is very specific.

The NRA supports me, and I'm happy to have them.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Date: 08/23/94
Re: NFIB, Lehigh Valley, Health Care Luncheon in Allentown
Media: WFMZ Channel 69, The Morning Call, WAEB

Comments:

The luncheon lasted from 12 Noon to about 2 PM. RS, after a brief introduction from a NFIB member from Washington, D.C., was the only speaker; he spoke for almost half an hour. Before speaking RS spent 10 minutes working the room table by table. The room held about one hundred small business men and women, who were receptive to RS and easily won over; they gave him a very enthusiastic standing ovation when he finished speaking.

RS opened by discussing the restrictions on freedom in the Clinton and Mitchell health care bills and then launched into the three possible directions the health care debate might take. The first, he said, is that Congress will actually pass a "good bill", meaning one based only on market reforms. The second possibility is that the Democrats, realizing they will not be able to pass a bill they want, will "pack up their toys and go home", as they did when confronted with a Republican "risk assesment" attached to an EPA bill. He spent about 5 minutes expounding upon the fact that Democrats are used to getting their own way, as it has been "forty years and three days" since the last Republican majority in the House of Representatives. The third possibility, and the one "we" have to watch out for, is that the Democrats will pull the same stunt they did with the Crime Bill, which is to pass acceptable bills in the House and Senate and then add on things in the conference report which neither house agreed to on the floor. RS did not say what would happen if the third possibility were to occur. He later drew a distinction between the Health Care and Crime bills by saying that a lot of the Republican who had "folded" ("I was not a foldee") on the crime bill did so because they did not want to return to their districts having voted down both bills, but that the passage of the crime bill took the pressure off, putting Clinton in an even more difficult position for passing Health Care. RS said that a lot of the Republican who had "folded" ("I was not a foldee") on the crime bill did so because they did not want to return to their districts having voted down both bills, but that the passage of the crime bill took the pressure off, putting Clinton in an even more difficult position for passing Health Care. RS said that a lot of the Republican who had "folded" ("I was not a foldee") on the crime bill did so because they did not want to return to their districts having voted down both bills, but that the passage of the crime bill took the pressure off, putting Clinton in an even more difficult position for passing Health Care.

In discussing the possibility of actually covering 100% of the population, RS said it was a myth, but one which the "liberals" were determined to pursue. When Clinton made that comment to the press about only being able to cover about 95% of Americans, RS said the liberals (I am nearly positive he mentioned HW by name here) were outraged that the President would do something liberals never do - tell the truth. HR Clinton is also aware that 100% covered is unattainable, RS asserted, and admitted as much when testifying to Ways and Means that, even in Hawaii, 3-4% remain uncovered. The actual number, according to

Someone in the audience asked RS if the press was fair to the Republicans (probably a plant, he has been asked this question before), and he gave credit to all the PA press, with the exception of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, for covering both sides of the debate. Pitts and Phila, however, because they cover news on a national level, reflect the bias of national press, and give the republican alternatives to the Clinton and Mitchell plans little credit.

RS: "The Inquirer and Pittsburgh papers do not[cover what local people say]. They cover national media...who don't cover the other side. They simply ignore it. Why? Because we're the minority and we don't count. And so you don't see the kind of detail and discussion about the Republican proposals, they're just 'tinkering with the system'...but the only serious thing is if the government does it, that's health reform, and it's unfortunate." RS is, however, encouraged "by the reporters who don't know enough not to be biased about what you're supposed to think in Washington."

His next question was about the Chairman of the Board of Bethlehem Steel in Lehigh Valley supporting President Clinton's proposal, implying that the "business community cannot speak with one voice."

RS: "I was hoping no one would ask me that question. I'm going to give one or my more milder responses to that, an, question, judging where I am....I would just suggest that after they succeed, if they do, in taking over the health care industry, that when they come after the steel industry, who's going to be there to protect that? And what you have to do is recognize that sometimes what is in the best interest of your company in the short term isn't in the best interest of your country in the long term. [Enthusiastic applause]

The next question came from someone who was clearly connected to the campaign. He wanted to know what happened if, under an employer mandate proposal, when the employee pays 20% and can never be cancelled, the employee simply does not pay.

RS: "You know, we asked that question over and over and over and over on the Ways and Means committee meeting, and you know, we never really got an answer. I mean, they'd sort of answer it and you'd say, well wait a minute, you really didn't answer it, and they'd come back and not answer it again. Ah, and they said, 'Well, they have to', well what happens if they don't? Do they lose their insurance? 'Well, no, but they have to,' well what if they don't? 'Well they have to,' and it just was a circular argument that you never got them to admit that if they don't, then you pick it up. Then someone else pays it. That if you just simply refuse to pay it, you're going to get your coverage anyway and someone else is going to pay the cost. What we have

into the system, who aren't going to pay for it and - you know, we're not going to throw these people in jail for not paying their insurance premiums. We're not going to do that. I mean we asked that question, 'No! Oh God we can't do that!' We can throw providers in jail if they provide services that aren't dictated by the federal plan, we can have patients who want to get services from someone outside of their network, we can throw them in jail, but we certainly can't throw these poor people who aren't going to pay their insurance."

In response to the final question about medical savings plans:

RS: "Well, number one, one of the things that we've strived for very very diligently is to get away from community ratings based on age. Because if you do - what they did in New York - they did community ratings, and they community rated everything with the exception, I think they allowed an exception for geography. But everything else was complete total community rating, and that is, everybody pays the same, no matter how old you are, how sick you are, where you live, your habits, whatever, it's all the same. And what happened? The average policy cost for a 22 year old, male or female, went up three times. Tripled. And the policy cost for a fifty-five year old or sixty year old went down a substantial. Another generational shift hitting square in the face Generation X. It gets nailed again. This is exactly what the Clinton plan calls for, it calls for community rating. What's going to happen under their plan, and that is younger people are going to pay a heck of a lot more. What happened in New York - their uninsured rate went up three percent....Now, what was the Clinton administration's response to the fact that the insurance rate dropped? 'Just goes to show ya, just goes to show ya, you have to have mandates, otherwise people will drop out of the system.' No. Just goes to show ya, you shouldn't do community rating. Or if you're going to do it, do it in a modified form that allows for age. Why should young people pay the same as someone 64 years old who's a smoker?"

in jail, but we certainly can't throw these poor people who aren't going to pay their insurance."

In response to the final question about medical savings plans:

RS: "Well, number one, one of the things that we've strived for very very diligently is to get away from community ratings based on age. Because if you do - what they did in New York - they did community ratings, and they community rated everything with the exception, I think they allowed an exception for geography. But everything else was complete total community rating, and that is, everybody pays the same, no matter how old you are, how sick you are, where you live, your habits, whatever, it's all the same. And what happened? The average policy cost for a 22 year old,

MEMO

TO: STU
FROM: TIM
DATE: 16 July 1994
TIME: 9:30 AM
TYPE OF EVENT: Town meeting
CROWD DESCRIPTION: About forty to fifty people, about 2/3
seniors, mostly all were RS supporters.
MEDIA: None noticed

The Clinton style, the Wofford style, because he is a supported of this too, believe the answer is to tax you more, sent that money to the federal government, so the federal government can hire a bunch of bureaucrats to make decisions to what's best for you. They're going to put a National Benefits Policy together to be determined in Washington. So every American will have the same insurance policies, and you can't get another one. You must take what they give you. Now, you can go out with after tax dollars and buy additional insurance, if you want, but you have to take the benefits they are provided for you.

'This isn't socialism, an this isn't government run medicine' they're saying that over and over again. This TV camera here in the back, you folks will see back there, is a tape recorder back there. That's Senator Wofford. Always- Every meeting I have. Every meeting, I have senator worrord sends his person to film every meeting that I have. Everywhere I go, I have Senator Wofford following me around. Say 'Hi' to Senator Wofford. So if You have anything you would like to say to him, please turn around and address it to that camera. But that's a typical tactic of James Carville, who's- I mean, even at official meetings, I mean, they do this. That's a typical tactic of his, I mean, they run this kind of politics where, you know, they try to take little sentences of what you say, break it in half, and say that you said something that you didn't say. What's also typical is something, I mean, he is even quoted having said this, 'That if you tell a lie enough, then people will believe you.' And that, pretty much, pretty much what's going on with President Clinton.

~~You do not hear President Clinton talk about any specifics in his health care bill, not one. They will not talk about specifics in their bill because once they tell you, as is in the Kennedy Bill that Senator Wofford supported and now claims is his bill, that there is up to a 16% payroll tax on that bill. 16%, that's higher than the Social Security payroll tax. The employer pays- excuse me- the employer pays 12% and the employee pays 4%. Now, he's not going to come back and tell you there's a 16% payroll tax. Never will he mention, never will he mention there are price controls. That there's spending limits on how much there's going to spent in each state.~~
You do not hear President Clinton talk about any specifics in his that, pretty much, pretty much what's going on with President Clinton.

You do not hear President Clinton talk about any specifics in his that, pretty much, pretty much what's going on with President Clinton.

You do not hear President Clinton talk about any specifics in his health care bill, not one. They will not talk about specifics in their bill because once they tell you, as is in the Kennedy Bill that Senator Wofford supported and now claims is his bill, that there is up to a 16% payroll tax on that bill. 16%, that's higher than the Social Security payroll tax. The employer pays- excuse me- the employer pays 12% and the employee pays 4%. Now, he's not going to come back and tell you there's a 16% payroll tax. Never will he mention, never will he mention there are price controls. That there's spending limits on how much there's going to spent in each state.

Under Senator Wofford's bill that he introduced with Senator Daschle, last year, he eliminates Medicare. He eliminates Medicaid. He talks so much about the Federal Employees Health Benefit System, you know, 'You should get what each member of Congress has,' you'll be hearing this their mantra now, that everyone should get what members of Congress have, and should be allowed to have the plan as members of Congress have. Well, members of Congress are like any other federal employee. We have no different benefit policy; we have the same. I always say, I have the same policy as the janitor who works in my building at the Longworth House Office Building. We get the same benefits. And the benefits, by the way. I pay about roughly 28, 29% of the cost of my insurance. The federal government picks up the other 71, or 72%. Under the Wofford bill, he eliminates Medicare, Medicaid, and that system and folds it all into one big government system under that particular bill. So that's one way that it's dealt with, basically eliminate it, and make it into what's called the single-payer. He's been a supporter of that from the very start, and has said many times that that's where he would like to end up.

Harris Wofford says we should have insurance- everyone should insurance as good as what members of Congress get. No, everyone should have insurance as good as Medicaid recipients have because Medicaid recipients have better insurance than members of Congress do, and that's a fact.

MEMO

To: Stuart
From: Olivia
Re: Santorum Pep-Rally for Volunteers
Location: Blue Marsh Lake Beach Pavilion, Berks Co.
Date: 07/10/94, 3:30 PM
Attendance: 75 local Santorum supporters
Media: Reading Eagle/Times

Comments:

The event was a very casual, folksy sort of BBQ, ostensibly to thank locals for their support, with a short (15 min) speech by Santorum while the burgers were grilling. Most of the citizens attending were elderly, or were families with young children. Santorum's speech dealt primarily with health care and sounded like warmed-over Fourth of July rhetoric, comparing the signing of the Declaration of Independence to the refusal to accept Clinton's health plan. The theme was choosing liberty over security.

Santorum began by stressing the importance of the Senate race on a national level, mentioning Carville as an important player, the fact that "Bill Clinton's coming in next week. I believe it is, for Harris Wofford's Philadelphia, for a \$10,000 a plate dinner," and that newspapers across the country were covering the race (Wall Street Journal, Chicago Tribune, USA Today). He mentioned that CNN followed him around (07/08) for a comparison piece on the race and that "Nightline is trying to get the two of us on this summer; I've already accepted, Wofford has not. They're trying to get us on to talk about how this race is the referendum race on the Clinton presidency, the referendum race on his health care policy." He stressed the need for personal involvement to combat high-profile political consultants and "over \$2 million in the bank already" and compared it to his 1990 congressional race, when he was outspent 3-1 and was a no-name, having "only lived in the county four years out of my life".

His description of our founding fathers rang funny, seeming to equate poverty with generally negative behavior, and stressing that the United States was founded by the rich and powerful. He began, "Here were 56 men. Fifty-six men who were not on welfare, who were not poor, who were not rabble-rousers and malcontents. These were 56 people of means; 56 of the most powerful, wealthy men in this country, who were willing to write their name on a document and sacrifice everything, everything, for what? For freedom. For the chance to do what was in their interest and their, and their family and their country's best interest, that's what they were willing to do. They were willing to give up the security that Britain offered, and it was security folks.... But those 56 wealthy people of

His description of our founding fathers rang funny, seeming to equate poverty with generally negative behavior, and stressing that the United States was founded by the rich and powerful. He began, "Here were 56 men. Fifty-six men who were not on welfare, who were not poor, who were not rabble-rousers and malcontents. These were 56 people of means; 56 of the most powerful, wealthy men in this country, who were willing to write their name on a document and sacrifice everything, everything, for what? For freedom. For the chance to do what was in their interest and their, and their family and their country's best interest, that's what they were willing to do. They were willing to give up the security that Britain offered, and it was security folks.... But those 56 wealthy people of

His description of our founding fathers rang funny, seeming to equate poverty with generally negative behavior, and stressing that the United States was founded by the rich and powerful. He began, "Here were 56 men. Fifty-six men who were not on welfare, who were not poor, who were not rabble-rousers and malcontents. These were 56 people of means; 56 of the most powerful, wealthy men in this country, who were willing to write their name on a document and sacrifice everything, everything, for what? For freedom. For the chance to do what was in their interest and their, and their family and their country's best interest, that's what they were willing to do. They were willing to give up the security that Britain offered, and it was security folks.... But those 56 wealthy people of

are willing to give up liberty in exchange for security deserve neither liberty nor security.' Eisenhower, 200 years later, said 'If you want security in America go to jail.' Because that's the, because that's the only place where you are perfectly secure. This country isn't the land of security, it is the land of opportunity.... That's what this race is about. Because today we're being offered by a government all the security you want - the Health **Security** Act. You give us freedom, you give up your freedom, you give up responsibility, you give up money, you give up the power to make decisions, you give them to Washington and we will take care of you. We fought that battle 218 years ago, we have to fight it again today." Applause. Santorum then segued into the relatively small sacrifice required by supporters today - bumper stickers, talking to neighbors etc. He ended his speech by comparing the audience to the "patriots of old" and received a standing ovation.

Santorum then fielded some questions, the first about receiving financial support from the state Republicans. He responded, "Ah, the ah, the state Republican Party can help a little bit, they have a, federal races it's very difficult for state parties to really get that involved in federal races because we have very strict, ah rules on who can help. Ah, the primary for example they couldn't really do anything for us. They couldn't even have people work for us, because it's considered a in-kind contribution, they have to account for it, it's very difficult to do that. So, they have a federal fund set up that they can use to help us but basically what they're gonna do is just do general voter registration, turn out the vote, which generically helps all Republican candidates, doesn't specifically target us, and that's just really because of the limitation they have on their ability to help. Ah, the more important source of support is from the Senate Committee in Washington. The Senate Committee in Washington can give what is called a co-ordinated expenditure, which is about, which is really over a million dollars that they can help spend in Pennsylvania, for media, basically television is what they do, is what they use it for. That's really the primary source of help, not the State Party."

The second question was about his stance on the NRA, to which he responded, "I ah, I don't support gun control, I voted against it consistently as a member of Congress and will do not the State Party."

The second question was about his stance on the NRA, to which he responded, "I ah, I don't support gun control, I voted against it consistently as a member of Congress and will do so as a member of the Senate." He related this back to the want to the search **security** we're liberty and then said you "Give up your freedom, you give up responsibility, you give up money, you give up the power to make decisions, you give them to Washington and we will take care of you. We fought that battle 218 years ago, we have to fight it again today." Applause. Santorum then segued into the relatively small sacrifice required by supporters today - bumper stickers, talking to neighbors etc. He ended his speech by comparing the audience to the "patriots of old" and received a standing ovation.

Santorum then fielded some questions, the first about receiving financial support from the state Republicans. He responded, "Ah, the ah, the state Republican Party can help a little bit, they have a, federal races it's very difficult for state parties to really get that involved in federal races

that's being debated in Congress right now, which is, ah, you might even make the argument this is a pro-criminal bill. We tried to get substantial, let's call it habeas corpus reform, which is the appeals process for the death penalty, and right now, literally, death, people on death row stay on death row for an average of ten to fifteen years, because they appeal and appeal and appeal and appeal. Under a Republican proposal we limit it to - after all the appeals with the case are over, just to give you an idea, that usually takes several years and on average 27 different judges view this case, before we say 'OK, that's it, that's the Supreme Court's decided that the case is sound', we give one more appeal on the sentence, the death sentence. Now if new evidence comes up as to guilt or innocence you can always appeal, but as far as whether the sentence was proper, you get one more appeal. That, we believe, will create more certainty....We have to have certainty, we have to have rules of evidence that allow evidence to get in as long as it's gathered in good faith, and not some technical problem with it. Those are the kinds of things that we can do. What we shouldn't do is what's being proposed in the crime bill. What's being proposed in the crime bill is \$8 billion dollars of new welfare spending. Eight bil, have you heard about this new midnight basketball? We are going to actually pay states to set up basketball leagues starting at midnight. Think about this. You know, ~~this is the law of unintended consequences~~. Do you want kids out on the street at midnight? No. Then why are we setting up a formal mechanism to get them out there? ~~would you take your children out playing basketball at midnight?~~ [crowd - "No"] Then why should we have other people's children out there playing basketball at midnight? If it's not good enough for your kids, then what are we saying about the people who we're trying to get in these leagues? What we're saying is, they're not as good as we are. What we're saying is, we don't respect them enough, as much as we respect our own self and our own children. See, that's what's wrong with liberalism. They treat people as less than human beings. They treat them as clients who can't take responsibility for themselves."

To the fourth question, regarding press coverage, he replied, "You know, it's, it's hard. I mean, a lot of the times, in defense of the media they just simply aren't informed, I mean, ~~no offense~~ but they really aren't. a lot of the media just

To the fourth question, regarding press coverage, he replied, "You know, it's, it's hard. I mean, a lot of the times, in defense of the media they just simply aren't informed, I mean, ~~no offense~~ but they really aren't. a lot of the media just

To the fourth question, regarding press coverage, he replied, "You know, it's, it's hard. I mean, a lot of the times, in defense of the media they just simply aren't informed, I mean, ~~no offense~~ but they really aren't. a lot of the media just

To the fourth question, regarding press coverage, he replied, "You know, it's, it's hard. I mean, a lot of the times, in defense of the media they just simply aren't informed, I mean, no offense, but they really aren't, a lot of the media just simply isn't informed enough to get it right, and so they don't, I don't think they're necessarily malicious, ah, but they, they, they don't, they don't, they aren't as particular and as a result things are written that aren't accurate. I mean it's not because, again, a malicious intent, it's more that a lot of the folks who are writing the articles simply don't have, ah, background to be able to, to, to fairly represent what you say. I mean, I think we've done fairly well here with the paper in Reading....if there's anybody here from Lancaster I certainly could let you have a word or two about what's going on down

down there, they, they, they just simply only will tell one side of the story. And they will do everything they can to keep my name out of that paper. I mean I could, it's amazing, I could give you AP articles written out of Washington based on things that I did. Well, particularly in the welfare area, where the article was written and my name was quoted several times in the article and they literal, they'd run the article in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and they'd just clip the paragraphs where my name was mentioned. I mean that's how bad it was."

Finally, he mentioned that Senators Dole, Hutchinson, and D'Amato, and Jack Kemp had all been to PA to help out, demonstrating the importance of this race on a national level. He also mentioned having done Equal Time with Mary Matalin, and that "she agreed to come up, and do an event for us, ah, which I thought was sort of fun, since her husband's running, ah, the other campaign."

Santorum's assistant Christian Leinbach, who is responsible for Northeastern PA, introduced his intern Terry Miller, Berks County Co-ordinator Joan Lunden, Lebanon County Co-ordinator Greg Spittle, and Dave Argle, a State Rep. from Schuylkill county, who described Santorum's active campaigning there, and his radio add playing in that county criticizing Wofford for never having visited.

Finally, before eating, we bowed our heads and Christian led us in prayer, thanking God for letting us hear Rick, and asking Him to bless Rick as he moves across the state. "Lord, we pray that you will work in this campaign. In Jesus' name, Amen."

Philadelphia Inquirer, and they'd just clip the paragraphs where my name was mentioned. I mean that's how bad it was."

Finally, he mentioned that Senators Dole, Hutchinson, and D'Amato, and Jack Kemp had all been to PA to help out, demonstrating the importance of this race on a national level. He also mentioned having done Equal Time with Mary Matalin, and that "she agreed to come up, and do an event for us, ah, which I thought was sort of fun, since her husband's running, ah, the other campaign."

Santorum's assistant Christian Leinbach, who is responsible for Northeastern PA, introduced his intern Terry Miller, Berks County Co-ordinator Joan Lunden, Lebanon County Co-ordinator Greg Spittle, and Dave Argle, a State Rep. from Schuylkill county, who described Santorum's active campaigning there, and his radio add

MEMO

TO: Stu
FROM: Tim
DATE: 27 June 1994
TIME: 10:00 AM
TYPE OF MEETING: Pennsylvania State Senate Public Health and
Welfare Hearing on Medisave
CROWD DESCRIPTION: Crowd of 30-40 people observing, 15 protesters
with signs
MEDIA COVERAGE: ABC News-Nightline; Radio PA (Susan Schroch);
WLYH-TV; WHTM-TV (Miles Ross); UPI (Gary Ross);
Harrisburg Patriot (Pete Shelley); AP (Pam
Sampson)

RS began by defending and offering background on Medisave:

Medical savings account is not a comprehensive reform of the health care system. It is not the only the only thing we need to do. It is an important part of a series of reforms that need to take place...It brings personal responsibility back to the health care system, a very important lesson which I hope to expound on just a little bit in my testimony. But I think it's very important because when I hear critics of medical savings accounts. ~~The criticism is that it is the only thing that we want to do.~~ In fact, it isn't. There is necessary insurance reform that needs to take place.

RS continued:

Back in 1960, we spent about 50% of all our health care dollars out of pocket. We paid for things out of pocket 50% of all expenditures. Today, that number is around twenty percent. If you look at hospital bills, 95% of all hospital bills are paid by someone other than the person who's [getting] the service. What is the incentive to look at the bill? What's the incentive worry about whether you need an additional test, or want an additional test.

look at the bill? What's the incentive worry about whether you need an additional test, or want an additional test.

From 1960 to 1993 or '92, with respect to what we pay out of pocket, and with it the growth of healthcare

TIME: 10:00 AM

TYPE OF MEETING: Pennsylvania State Senate Public Health and
Welfare Hearing on Medisave
CROWD DESCRIPTION: Crowd of 30-40 people observing, 15 protesters
with signs
MEDIA COVERAGE: ABC News-Nightline; Radio PA (Susan Schroch);
WLYH-TV; WHTM-TV (Miles Ross); UPI (Gary Ross);
Harrisburg Patriot (Pete Shelley); AP (Pam
Sampson)

RS began by defending and offering background on Medisave:

Medical savings account is not a comprehensive reform of the health care system. It is not the only the only thing

On the unrealistic notion that people would save this money for health purposes, even preventive healthcare, RS stated:

Close to 60% of the people who are uninsured for a period of six months or less. With Medical Savings accounts, and having the money in your account, those dollars in your account, if you will if you were to lose your job, and usually when people lose their job, that's the first time you lose your insurance. If you were to have some saved, if you look at the numbers as to who would be able to save. About 85% of the people in this country don't spend \$3000 a year on healthcare. So 85% of the people in the country would be able to save something, some small amount, or, in many cases, large amount.

To the question, "You are not suggesting that be an employer mandate?"

Absolutely not. There are people that have got to understand that there is no such thing as an employer mandate in . What the things that are being talked about in Washington are no more an employer mandate than the Social Security Tax is an employer mandate. You're requiring people to pay anywhere from eight to twelve percent of their payroll to the federal government in most cases, or in some cases a portion to the federal government, a portion to the insurance companies. The federal government requires you to make a payment to the Internal Revenue Service, it's not a mandate, it's a tax. I don't support that idea, I don't think it's necessary, and people miss the point...Health insurance is just part of the compensation package, you know, they may pay more wages, and they pay less for health insurance...You can't look at health insurance as some extra; it's part of the compensation package.

Senator Schwartz commented, "There's no guarantee in you're proposal that it will be done in the way that you suggest. And there's no requirement on employers to do it the way you suggest the way you suggest."

RS responded:

The employer cannot pay less for the medical savings account than they do to an other employee who takes any the way you suggest.

RS responded:

The employer cannot pay less for the medical savings account than they do to an other employee who takes any other option. So the benefit contribution from the employer is standard. usually when people lose their job, that's the first time you lose your insurance. If you were to have some saved, if you look at the numbers as to who would be able to save. About 85% of the people in this country don't spend \$3000 a year on healthcare. So 85% of the people in the country would be able to save something, some small amount, or, in many cases, large amount.

To the question, "You are not suggesting that be an employer mandate?"

Absolutely not. There are people that have got to understand that there is no such thing as an employer mandate in . What the things that are being talked about in Washington are no more an employer mandate than

you're providing a basic level of insurance for poor people, and we are giving them the opportunity access to the system. If you do better, and your employer continues not to buy insurance, then you can probably buy a little better plan.

In conclusion, RS tried to sound sincere,

I very much support healthcare reform and have been working very diligently to get the kind of reform that I think is in the best tradition of America, which is empowering individuals with responsibility, not giving up that responsibility to federal government for them to make decisions for you.

I very much support healthcare reform and have been working very diligently to get the kind of reform that I think is in the best tradition of America, which is empowering individuals with responsibility, not giving up that responsibility to federal government for them to make decisions for you.

Santorum on WBUP 1230, Beaver Falls

8/22/94 9-10 pm

Comment on Crime Bill from Harris Wofford (recorded earlier): You'll find that this bill has various protections to make sure that the big cities don't get an ^{use}undo part of the money, that a major part of this is reserved for smaller communities.

Santorum: Well, you know, first off again, you have two levels. Number one is the police officers and I've talked and as I've talked before -- alot of it has to do with local matching grants and a very costly procedure to hire police officers and etc. and a lot of local communities aren't going to be able to be able to participate in that and a lot are not going to be able to put up the cost or go through the procedures to do so with respect to the social programs. [continued with argument about duplicative social programs] These programs already exist in current law. Now if Beaver County thinks that they are getting a lot of money for these programs and they're getting their fair share versus you know the City of Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, Cleveland or wherever, then you go ahead and believe Harris Wofford. But if you realize that places like, you know, Rochester don't do as well as places like Philadelphia then I would suspect that you question the Senator's remarks.

[NOTE: • Wofford urged full funding for the Edward Byrne Memorial Grant Program, which funded \$15,022 and \$7,892 for the "Expedited Case List" program; \$25,439 for the "School-based Probation" program; and \$133,782 for the "Sanctions Options for Sentencing/Probation/Parole" program. (Source: *Beaver County Record*, 8/22/94, p. 1000 PA Commission on Crime and Delinquency Data)]

Another comment from **Wofford:** There are also special parts of the bill that provide for action in rural areas, there's flexibility given so that all the money doesn't have to be put into new cops if a community was to use some of these resources for other methods of action and I am sure that the administration of the bill is going to see that smaller communities are very much on the front line of this.

Santorum: This is the amazing part, I mean this is another way of putting what I put earlier. Which is he said all of this money won't have to be ^{used} for new cops. The community can make that decision. This bill sets up community groups to make decisions on how to spend the money for new cops and if you're in a community that uh you know where your have community groups saying we want more social programs then you're not even going to get new cops and a lot. and that sort of is a ridiculous thing -- here's the money that is supposed

Santorum: Well, you know, first off again, you have two levels. Number one is the police officers and I've talked and as I've talked before -- alot of it has to do with local matching grants and a very costly procedure to hire police officers and etc. and a lot of local communities aren't going to be able to be able to participate in that and a lot are not going to be able to put up the cost or go through the procedures to do so with respect to the social programs. [continued with argument about duplicative social programs] These programs already exist in current law. Now if Beaver County thinks that they are getting a lot of money for these programs and they're getting their fair share versus you know the City of Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, Cleveland or wherever, then you go ahead and believe Harris Wofford. But if you realize that places like, you know, Rochester don't do as well as places like Philadelphia then I would suspect that you question the Senator's remarks.